arXiv:1510.08980v1 [cs.GT] 30 Oct 2015

The Complexity of Equilibria for Risk-Modeling Valuations*

Marios Mavronicolas† *Burkhard Monien*‡

(November 2, 2015)

Abstract

We study the complexity of deciding the existence of *mixed equilibria* for minimization games where players use *valuations* other than expectation to evaluate their *costs*. We consider *risk-averse* players seeking to minimize the sum $\mathsf{V} = \mathsf{E} + \mathsf{R}$ of *expectation* E and a *risk valuation* R of their costs; R is non-negative and vanishes exactly when the cost incurred to a player is constant over all choices of strategies by the other players. In a V-*equilibrium,* no player could unilaterally reduce her cost.

Say that V has the *Weak-Equilibrium-for-Expectation* property if all strategies supported in a player's *best-response* mixed strategy incur the same conditional expectation of her cost. We introduce E-*strict concavity* and observe that every E-strictly concave valuation has the *Weak-Equilibrium-for-Expectation* property. We focus on a broad class of valuations shown to have the *Weak-Equilibrium-for-Expectation* property, which we exploit to prove two main complexity results, the first of their kind, for the two simplest cases of the problem:

- Two strategies: Deciding the existence of a V-equilibrium is strongly $\mathcal{NP}$-hard for the restricted class of *player-specific scheduling games on two ordered links* [22], when choosing R as (1) Var (*variance*), or (2) SD (*standard deviation*), or (3) a concave linear sum of even *moments* of small order.
- Two players: Deciding the existence of a V-equilibrium is strongly $\mathcal{NP}$-hard when choosing R as (1) $\gamma \cdot \mathsf{Var}$, or (2) $\gamma \cdot \mathsf{SD}$, where $\gamma > 0$ is the *risk-coefficient,* or choosing V as (3) a convex combination of $\mathsf{E} + \gamma \cdot \mathsf{Var}$ and the concave ν-*valuation* $\nu^{-1}(\mathsf{E}(\nu(\cdot)))$, where $\nu(x) = x^r$, with $r \geq 2$. This is a concrete consequence of a general strong $\mathcal{NP}$-hardness result that only needs the *Weak-Equilibrium-for-Expectation* property and a few additional properties for V; its proof involves a reduction with a single parameter, which can be chosen efficiently so that each valuation satisfies the additional properties.

*Partially supported by the German Research Foundation (DFG) within the Collaborative Research Centre "On-the-Fly-Computing" (SFB 901), and by funds for the promotion of research at University of Cyprus.

†Department of Computer Science, University of Cyprus, Nicosia CY-1678, Cyprus. Email mavronic@ucy.ac.cy

‡Faculty of Electrical Engineering, Computer Science and Mathematics, University of Paderborn, 33102 Paderborn, Germany. Email bm@upb.de

1 Introduction

1.1 The Pros and Cons of Expectation

In a *game,* each *player* is using a *mixed strategy,* a probability distribution over her *strategies*; her *cost* depends on the choices of all players and is evaluated by a *valuation*: a function from probability distributions to reals. The most prominent valuation in *Non-Cooperative Game Theory* is *expectation*; each player minimizes her expected cost.

A drawback of expectation is that it may not accomodate *risk* and its impact on strategic decision; this inadequacy of expectation was addressed as early as 1738 by Bernoulli [4]. Indeed, *risk-averse* players [1] are willing to accept a larger amount of payment rather than gambling and taking the risk of a larger cost; according to [15], "a risk-averse player is willing to pay something for certainty". So, valuations other than expectation have been sought (cf. [1, 10, 21, 27]). *Concave* valuations, such as *variance* and *standard deviation,* are well-suited to model risk-averse minimizing players. Already in 1906, Fisher [14] proposed attaching standard deviation to expectation as an additive measure of risk.

In his seminal paper [21], Markowitz introduced the *Mean-Variance* approach to portfolio maximization, advocating the minimization of variance constrained on some lower bound on the expected return. This way, instead of a single optimal solution, a class of "efficient" solutions, termed as the *Efficient frontier* [10], is defined, incurring the lowest risk for a given level of expected return. Popular valuations for determining a single maximizing solution from the *Efficient frontier* are *(i)* $\mathsf{E} - \gamma \cdot \mathsf{Var}$, where E and Var stand for *expectation* and *variance,* respectively, and $\gamma > 0$ describes the risk tolerance (see [10]), and *(ii)* the *Sharpe Ratio* $\mathsf{SR} = \mathsf{E}/\mathsf{SD}$ [27], where SD stands for *standard deviation.* The *Mean-Variance* paradigm [21] created Modern Portfolio Theory [10] as a new field and initiated a tremendous amount of research — see the surveys [20, 28] for an overview. However, in the *Mean-Variance* paradigm [21], only expectation and variance were used for evaluating the return; this choice is justified only if the return is normally distributed [17]. Subsequently this inadequacy led to risk models involving higher *moments* so as to accomodate returns with a more general distribution [19].

We now switch back to the minimization setting. A significant advantage of expectation is that it guarantees the existence of a *Nash equilibrium* [24, 25], where each player is playing a *best-response* mixed strategy and could not unilaterally reduce her expected cost. Existence of equilibria (for minimization games) extends to *convex* valuations [8, 11], but may fail for non-convex and even for *concave* ones. *Crawford's game* [7, Section 4] was the *first* counterexample game with no equilibrium for a certain valuation; for more counterexamples, see [9, 22]. The view that *mixed* equilibria get "endangered" in games where players are not expectation-optimizers has been put forward in [7] and adopted further in [12, 22].

Fiat and Papadimitriou [12] introduced the equilibrium computation problem in games where risk-averse players use valuations more general than expectation, and addressed the complexity of deciding the existence of such equilibria.* Subsequently, Mavronicolas and Monien [22] focused on the concave valuation *expectation plus variance,* for which they established structural and complexity results for their introduced class of *player-specific scheduling games* [22, Section 3]; their results provided a solid basis for the study of more general concave valuations.

1.2 Valuations More General than Expectation

In this work, we shall consider minimization games. We model the valuation of each player as the sum $\mathsf{V} = \mathsf{E} + \mathsf{R}$, where E and R are the *expectation* and *risk valuation,* respectively. The formulation of $(\mathsf{E} + \mathsf{R})$-*valuations* draws motivation from the *Mean-Variance* paradigm [21], and from the *Variance Principle* and the *Standard Deviation Principle,* two standard *premium principles* in Actuarial Risk Theory (cf. [18, Section 5.3]), by which $\mathsf{V} = \mathsf{E} + \gamma \cdot \mathsf{Var}$ (resp., $\mathsf{V} = \mathsf{E} + \gamma \cdot \mathsf{SD}$), where $\gamma > 0$ is the *risk-coefficient.* We focus on the associated decision problem, denoted as $\exists\mathsf{V}$-EQUILIBRIUM, asking, given a game G, whether G has a V-*equilibrium,* where no player could unilaterally reduce her cost (as evaluated by V). *What is the impact of properties of* V *on the complexity of* $\exists\mathsf{V}$-EQUILIBRIUM*?*†

We stipulate a very basic property for R, called *Risk-Positivity*: the value of R is non-negative, en par with the *Non-negative Loading* property of the premium principles in [18, Section 5.3.1]; it is 0, yielding no risk, exactly when the cost incurred to a player is constant over all choices of strategies by the other players.

We shall focus on concave valuations. A key property of a concave valuation, called *Optimal-Value*, we prove and exploit is that it maintains the same optimal value over all convex combinations of strategies supported in a given best-response mixed strategy (Proposition 3.1). Unfortunately, unlike Var, moments of order higher than 2 are not concave. But on the positive side, all even moments have the *Risk-Positivity* property. Besides, recent work in Portfolio Theory [19] motivates using higher moments to model risk.

To obtain an enhanced class of interesting concave valuations, we introduce into the context of equilibrium computation valuations prominent for evaluating risk in Actuarial Risk Theory, which are transferred from the *Mean Value Principle* (see [18, Section 5.3]). Specifically, we shall consider ν-*valuations* of the form $\mathsf{V}^{\nu} = \nu^{-1}(\mathsf{E}(\nu(\cdot)))$, for any increasing and strictly convex

*The work in [12] considered the dual setting where risk-averse players *maximize* non-concave valuations; they focused on the convex valuation *expectation minus variance.*

†Strictly speaking, some of the considered properties of V are rather properties of the equilibria of some game G whose players minimize V. For ease of presentation, we shall omit reference to G since G will be either fixed or clear from context in the settings we shall consider, so that the property depends only on V.

function ν, so that ν^{-1} is concave.[‡] It is good news that for ν increasing and strictly convex, $\mathsf{R}^\nu := \mathsf{V}^\nu - \mathsf{E}$ has the *Risk-Positivity* property (Lemma 2.1); so, V^ν is an $(\mathsf{E}+\mathsf{R})$-valuation.

1.3 Weak-Equilibrium-for-Expectation and E-Strict Concavity

As our main tool, we shall exploit the *Weak-Equilibrium-for-Expectation* property [22, Section 2.6]: all strategies supported in a player's best-response mixed strategy induce the same conditional expectation, taken over all random choices of the other players, for her cost; thus, the player is holding a *unique* expectation for her cost no matter which of her supported strategies she ends up choosing. This property holds vacuously for Nash equilibria [24, 25]. The *Weak-Equilibrium-for-Expectation* property formalizes the most natural intuition for the players' expectations; hence, it is a very natural property to seek and employ in the setting of risk. We aim at an enhanced class of valuations with the *Weak-Equilibrium-for-Expectation* property.

We introduce an E-*strictly concave valuation* as a concave valuation which, viewed as a function of a single mixed strategy, fulfills the definition of a strictly concave function for any pair of mixed strategies inducing different expectations (Definition 2.2). We observe that a convex combination of an E-strictly concave valuation and a concave valuation is E-strictly concave (Corollary 2.2); furthermore, Var and SD are E-strictly concave (Lemma 2.3). Hence, a wide class of concrete instances of E-strictly concave valuations results by plugging in the convex combination *(i)* $\mathsf{E}+\gamma\cdot\mathsf{Var}$ for an E-strictly concave valuation, with $\gamma > 0$, and *(ii)* a ν-valuation, with an increasing and strictly convex function ν, for a concave valuation (Corollary 2.4). We establish the key fact that every E-strictly concave valuation has the *Weak-Equilibrium-for-Expectation* property (Proposition 3.2). E-strictly concave valuations make the largest subclass of concave valuations we know of with the *Weak-Equilibrium-for-Expectation* property.

An obstacle to extending the *Weak-Equilibrium-for-Expectation* property to moments of order higher than 2 is their non-concavity. Instead we consider concave linear sums of even moments. (Even order is needed to guarantee the *Risk-Positivity* property.) We use the *Optimal-Value* property (Proposition 3.1) to establish that such concave valuations have the *Weak-Equilibrium-for-Expectation* property (Corollary 3.4); this property renders such concave linear sums of even moments sufficiently interesting to consider.

1.4 Complexity Results for More General Valuations

By exploiting the *Weak-Equilibrium-for-Expectation* property for an $(\mathsf{E}+\mathsf{R})$-valuation V, we shall show the strong $\mathcal{NP}$-hardness of $\exists\mathsf{V}$-EQUILIBRIUM for the two simplest cases: games with

[‡]For the special case $\nu(x) = e^x$, V^ν corresponds to the *moment generating function* (cf. [18, Section 2.4]) and has gained special attention as the *Exponential Principle* premium in Actuarial Risk Theory [18, Section 5.3].

two strategies and games with two players; these are the *first* complexity results for deciding the existence of equilibria in the context of risk-modeling valuations (cf. Section 1.5).

1.4.1 Two Strategies

We discover that the complexity of ∃V-EQUILIBRIUM is captured by *player-specific scheduling games on two ordered links* [22, Section 5.2.2], where the cost of player i on a *link* ℓ she chooses is a sum of *weights* $\omega(i, i', \ell)$, each corresponding to player i, link ℓ and a player i' choosing the same link.[§] *Two ordered links* [22, Section 5.2.2] means that link 1 incurs less weight than link 2 to a player due to another player choosing the same link unless both weights are 0. We show that for an $(\mathsf{E}+\mathsf{R})$-valuation V, ∃V-EQUILIBRIUM is strongly $\mathcal{NP}$-hard for the class of player-specific scheduling games on two ordered links when R is (1) Var, or (2) SD, or (3) a concave linear sum of even moments of order $k \in \{2, 4, 6, 8\}$ (Theorem 4.6).

Instrumental to the proof of Theorem 4.6 is the key property we show that a concave linear sum of even moments of order $k \in \{2, 4, 6, 8\}$ enjoys the *Mixed-Player-Has-Pure-Neighbors* property: each player i either is pure or has all of her neighbors (that is, players i' with $\omega(i, i', 1) \neq 0$) pure (Proposition 4.3). This property is a quantitative expression of the view that mixed equilibria get "endangered" when players are not expectation-optimizers (cf. [7, 12, 22]). The class of concave linear sum of even moments of order $k \in \{2, 4, 6, 8\}$ is the largest class of valuations we were able to identify with the *Mixed-Player-Has-Pure-Neighbors* property. We conjecture that every concave linear sum of even moments enjoys the property.

1.4.2 Two Players

We show that ∃V-EQUILIBRIUM is strongly $\mathcal{NP}$-hard when V is an $(\mathsf{E}+\mathsf{R})$-valuation V with the *Weak-Equilibrium-for-Expectation* property provided that there is a polynomial time computable δ, $0 < \delta \leq \frac{1}{4}$, such that three additional conditions hold (Theorem 5.1); the requirement that δ be polynomial time computable stems from the fact that δ enters the reduction as a parameter. The first two such conditions ((2/a) and (2/b)) stipulate a particular inequality and a particular monotonicity property, respectively. The third condition (2/c) refers to the *Crawford game* $\mathsf{G}_C(\delta)$, a generalization of a bimatrix game from [7, Section 4], whose bimatrix involves δ; it is required that $\mathsf{G}_C(\delta)$ has no V-equilibrium. The game $\mathsf{G}_C(\delta)$ is used as a "gadget" in the reduction. The proof of Theorem 5.1, involving a reduction with a single parameter δ, is

[§]In the well-known model of *weighted congestion games with player-specific latency functions* [23], each weighted player may use a different, *player-specific* cost function of the total weight on her selected link; in this model, it is the weights that are *player-specific,* while each cost function is the identity one.

very general since it refers to no particular valuation but to a class of valuations enjoying two natural properties, *Risk-Positivity* and *Weak-Equilibrium-for-Expectation*.

Concrete strong $\mathcal{NP}$-hardness results follow as instantiations of Theorem 5.1 for three particular valuations (1) $\mathsf{V} = \mathsf{E}+\gamma\cdot\mathsf{Var}$, (2) $\mathsf{V} = \mathsf{E}+\gamma\cdot\mathsf{SD}$, and (3) $\mathsf{V} = \lambda\cdot(\mathsf{E}+\gamma\cdot\mathsf{Var})+(1-\lambda)\cdot\mathsf{V}^{\nu}$, with $0 < \lambda \leq 1$, where ν is the increasing and strictly convex function $\nu(x) = x^r$, with $r \geq 2$, and with $\gamma > 0$ (Theorem 5.12). For all three valuations in Theorem 5.12, we prove that the three additional conditions in Theorem 5.1 hold. In particular, for Condition (2/c), we prove that $\mathsf{G}_C(\delta)$ has no V-equilibrium for *any* value $0 < \delta < 1$; for the valuation (3), this holds in the more general case ν is any increasing and strictly convex function (Lemma 5.11).

1.5 Summary, Significance and Related Work

For a concave valuation V, there may or may not exist a V-equilibrium; we have identified V^{ν}, with an increasing and strictly convex function ν, as an example of a concave valuation V for which every game has a V-equilibrium (cf. Section 5). However, restricting to a *strictly concave* valuation excludes the existence of a mixed V-equilibrium. Restricting instead to an E-strictly concave valuation V, a mixed V-equilibrium may or may not exist; *what this work is revealing is that it then becomes strongly $\mathcal{NP}$-hard to decide if there is one already for the two simplest cases, games with two strategies or two players* (Theorems 4.6, 5.1 and 5.12).

While bringing concave valuations from Actuarial Risk Theory [18] into play, our framework encompasses general classes of $(\mathsf{E}+\mathsf{R})$-valuations, assuming the *Risk-Positivity* property, that also enjoy the *Weak-Equilibrium-for-Expectation* property, and a few additional properties. The $(\mathsf{E}+\mathsf{Var})$-equilibria on which [12, 22] focused are a special case of our general framework.

Fiat and Papadimitriou [12, Theorem 5] presented a proof sketch to claim that it is $\mathcal{NP}$-hard to decide the existence of an $(\mathsf{E}+\mathsf{Var})$-equilibrium for games with two players; unfortunately, their proof had been flawed, containing several gaps and errors. In personal communication with Fiat and Papadimitriou [13], they state: *"The proof, as is, has gaps and errors, which we believe can be fixed to yield a proof with the same architecture, but we have not done it yet."* In lack of a proof, the complexity of deciding the existence of an $(\mathsf{E}+\mathsf{Var})$-equilibrium for games with two players has remained open, and Theorems 5.1 and 5.12 represent new results, with Theorem 5.12 encompassing $(\mathsf{E}+\mathsf{Var})$-equilibria as a special case. Our reduction adapts techniques originally used by Conitzer and Sandholm [6, Section 3] to show that deciding the existence of Nash equilibria with certain properties for games with two players is $\mathcal{NP}$-complete.

Fiat and Papadimitriou [12, Section 2] coined a notion termed as *strict concavity,* denoted here as FP-*strict concavity,* which is similar to but different than E-strict concavity. It turns out that their difference is essential since $\mathsf{E}+\mathsf{Var}$ is *not* FP-strictly concave while it is E-strictly

concave.[¶] In fact, no concrete example of an FP-strictly concave valuation was given in [12]. Fiat and Papadimitriou [12, Theorem 3 & Observation 4] proved the sparsity of *mixed* V-equilibria, when V is FP-strictly concave: games with a mixed V-equilibrium have measure 0. The sparsity of mixed (E+Var)-equilibria follows from [5, Theorem 1] where it is established that (E + Var) is a *Mean-Variance Preference Function* [5, Claim 1].[‖] Contrary to their sparsity, this work establishes that deciding the existence of mixed (E + Var)-equilibria is strongly $\mathcal{NP}$-hard (Theorems 4.6 and 5.12).

It was known that E + Var, as well as E + SD, have the *Weak-Equilibrium-for-Expectation* property [22, Theorem 3.5]; they were also known to have the *Mixed-Player-Has-Pure-Neighbors* property for player-specific scheduling games on two ordered links [22, Theorem 5.13]. It was established in [5, Theorem 4] that there is always a *correlated equilibrium* [2] for E + Var.

1.6 Paper Organization

Section 2 presents the game-theoretic framework and introduces (E + R)-valuations and E-strict concavity. Equilibria and their properties are articulated in Section 3. The $\mathcal{NP}$-hardness results for two strategies and two players are presented in Sections 4 and 5, respectively. We conclude, in Section 6, with a discussion of the results and some open problems.

2 Games, (E + R)-Valuations and E-Strict Concavity

2.1 Games

For an integer $n \geq 2$, an *n-players game* G, or *game,* consists of *(i)* n finite sets $\{S_i\}_{i\in[n]}$ of *strategies,* and *(ii)* n *cost functions* $\{\mu_i\}_{i\in[n]}$, each mapping $\mathcal{S} = \times_{i\in[n]} S_i$ to the reals. So, $\mu_i(\mathbf{s})$ is the *cost* of player $i \in [n]$ on the *profile* $\mathbf{s} = \langle s_1, \ldots, s_n\rangle$ of strategies, one per player.

A *mixed strategy* for player $i \in [n]$ is a probability distribution p_i on S_i; the *support* of player i in p_i is the set $\sigma(p_i) = \{\ell \in S_i \mid p_i(\ell) > 0\}$. Denote as $\Delta_i = \Delta(S_i)$ the set of mixed strategies for player i. Player i is *pure* if for each strategy $s_i \in S_i$, $p_i(s_i) \in \{0, 1\}$; else she is *non-pure*. Denote as p_i^ℓ the *pure strategy* of player i choosing the strategy ℓ with probability 1.

A *mixed profile* is a tuple $\mathbf{p} = \langle p_1, \ldots, p_n\rangle$ of n mixed strategies, one per player; denote as $\Delta = \Delta(S) = \times_{i\in[n]}\Delta_i$ the set of mixed profiles. The mixed profile $\mathbf{p}$ induces probabilities $\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{s})$ for each profile $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{S}$ with $\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{s}) = \prod_{i'\in[n]} p_{i'}(s_{i'})$. For a player $i \in [n]$, the *partial profile* $\mathbf{s}_{-i}$ (resp., *partial mixed profile* $\mathbf{p}_{-i}$) results by eliminating the strategy s_i (resp., the mixed strategy

[¶]See the Appendix for the definition of FP-strict concavity and a proof that E+Var is not FP-strictly concave.
[‖]See Section 3.4 for the definition of Mean-Variance Preference Functions and their relation to this work.

p_i) from $\mathbf{s}$ (resp., $\mathbf{p}$). The partial mixed profile $\mathbf{p}_{-i}$ induces probabilities $\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{s}_{-i})$ for each partial profile $\mathbf{s}_{-i} \in \mathcal{S}_{-i} := \times_{i' \in [n] \setminus \{i\}} S_{i'}$ with $\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{s}_{-i}) = \prod_{i' \in [n] \setminus \{i\}} p_{i'}(s_{i'})$.

A function $\mathsf{V} : \mathsf{T} \to \mathbb{R}$ on a convex set T is *concave* (resp., *strictly concave*) if for any two points $t_1, t_2 \in \mathsf{T}$ and any number $\delta \in [0,1]$ (resp., $\delta \in (0,1)$), $\mathsf{V}(\delta\, t_1 + (1-\delta)\, t_2) \geq \delta\, \mathsf{V}(t_1) + (1-\delta)\, \mathsf{V}(t_2)$ (resp., $\mathsf{V}(\delta\, t_1 + (1-\delta)\, t_2) > \delta\, \mathsf{V}(t_1) + (1-\delta)\, \mathsf{V}(t_2)$). A function $\mathsf{V} : \mathsf{T} \to \mathbb{R}$ on a convex set T is *convex* (resp., *strictly convex*) if $-\mathsf{V}$ is concave (resp., strictly concave).

2.2 $(\mathsf{E} + \mathsf{R})$-Valuations

For a player $i \in [n]$, a *valuation function,* or *valuation* for short, V_i is a real-valued function on $\Delta(\mathcal{S})$, yielding a value $\mathsf{V}_i(\mathbf{p})$ to each mixed profile $\mathbf{p}$, so that in the special case where $\mathbf{p}$ is a profile $\mathbf{s}$, $\mathsf{V}_i(\mathbf{s}) = \mu_i(\mathbf{s})$. A *valuation* $\mathsf{V} = \langle \mathsf{V}_1, \ldots, \mathsf{V}_n \rangle$ is a tuple of valuations, one per player; G^{V} denotes G together with V.** We now introduce a special class of valuations.

Definition 2.1 ($(\mathsf{E} + \mathsf{R})$-Valuation) *An $(\mathsf{E} + \mathsf{R})$-valuation is a valuation of the form $\mathsf{V} = \mathsf{E} + \mathsf{R}$, where E is the expectation valuation with $\mathsf{E}_i(\mathbf{p}) = \sum_{\mathbf{s} \in S} \mathbf{p}(\mathbf{s})\, \mu_i(\mathbf{s})$ for $i \in [n]$, and R is the risk valuation, a continuous valuation with the Risk-Positivity property: For each player $i \in [n]$ and mixed profile $\mathbf{p}$, (C.1) $\mathsf{R}_i(\mathbf{p}) \geq 0$ and (C.2) $\mathsf{R}_i(\mathbf{p}) = 0$ if and only if for each profile $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{S}$ with $\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{s}) > 0$, $\mu_i(\mathbf{s})$ remains constant over all choices of strategies by the other players; in such case, $\mathsf{V}_i(\mathbf{p}) = \mathsf{E}_i(\mathbf{p}) = \mu_i(\mathbf{s})$ for any profile $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{S}$ with $\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{s}) > 0$.*

For each integer $k \geq 0$, the *k-moment* valuation is given by

$$\mathsf{kM}_i(\mathbf{p}) \quad = \quad \sum_{\mathbf{s} \in S} \mathbf{p}(\mathbf{s})\, \left(\mu_i(\mathbf{s}) - \mathsf{E}_i(\mathbf{p})\right)^k \,,$$

for each player $i \in [n]$; so, $\mathsf{1M} = 0$. Furthermore, $\mathsf{2M}$, known as *variance* and denoted as Var, is concave; hence, also is the square root of variance, known as *standard deviation* and denoted as SD. However, k-moments of order higher than 2 are not concave.

We shall consider *ν-valuations* $\mathsf{V}^\nu = \nu^{-1}(\mathsf{E}(\nu(.)))$, for an increasing and strictly convex function ν; so, ν^{-1}, and hence V^ν, is concave. So, for a player i,

$$\mathsf{V}^\nu_i\,(\mathbf{p}) \quad = \quad \nu^{-1}\left(\sum_{\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{S}} \mathbf{p}\,(\mathbf{s}) \cdot \nu\,(\mu_i(\mathbf{s}))\right) ;$$

set also $\mathsf{R}^\nu := \mathsf{V}^\nu - \mathsf{E}$. We observe:

Lemma 2.1 *For an increasing and strictly convex function ν, the risk valuation R^ν has the Risk-Positivity property.*

**We shall mostly treat a valuation function V_i and a valuation V interchangeably for an easier notation; we shall use V_i only when p_i has some special property.

Proof: Fix a player $i \in [n]$ and a profile $\mathbf{p}$. Then, $\mathsf{R}_i^{\nu}(\mathbf{p}) \geq 0$ if and only if $\mathsf{V}_i^{\nu}(\mathbf{p}) \geq \mathsf{E}_i(\mathbf{p})$ if and only if

$$\nu^{-1}\left(\sum_{\mathbf{s}\in\mathcal{S}} \mathbf{p}(\mathbf{s}) \cdot \nu(\mu_i(\mathbf{s}))\right) \quad \geq \quad \sum_{\mathbf{s}\in\mathcal{S}} \mathbf{p}(\mathbf{s}) \cdot \mu_i(\mathbf{s})$$

if and only if (since ν is increasing)

$$\sum_{\mathbf{s}\in\mathcal{S}} \mathbf{p}(\mathbf{s}) \cdot \nu(\mu_i(\mathbf{s})) \quad \geq \quad \nu\left(\sum_{\mathbf{s}\in\mathcal{S}} p(\mathbf{s}) \cdot \mu_i(\mathbf{s})\right).$$

Now (C.1) follows since ν is convex; (C.2) follows since ν is strictly convex. ■

By Lemma 2.1, for an increasing and strictly convex function ν, V^{ν} is an $(\mathsf{E}+\mathsf{R})$-valuation.

We shall deal with cases where for a player $i \in [n]$ and a mixed profile $\mathbf{p}$, $\{\mu_i(\mathbf{s}) \mid \mathbf{p}(\mathbf{s}) > 0\} = \{a, b\}$ with $a < b$, so that $\mathsf{R}_i(\mathbf{p})$ depends on the three parameters a, b and q, where $q := \sum_{\mathbf{s}\in\mathcal{S} \,|\, \mu_i(\mathbf{s})=b} \mathbf{p}(\mathbf{s})$. Then, denote

$$\widehat{\mathsf{V}}_i(a,b,q) \quad := \quad a + q(b-a) + \widehat{\mathsf{R}}_i(a,b,q).$$

2.3 E-Strict Concavity

We introduce a refinement of concavity:

Definition 2.2 (E-Strict Concavity) *Fix a player i. The $(\mathsf{E}+\mathsf{R})$-valuation V_i is* E*-strictly concave if for every game G, the following conditions hold for a fixed partial mixed profile $\mathbf{p}_{-i}$:*

(1) *V_i is concave in the mixed strategy p_i.*

(2) *For a pair of mixed strategies $p_i', p_i'' \in \Delta(S_i)$, if $\mathsf{E}_i(p_i', \mathbf{p}_{-i}) \neq \mathsf{E}_i(p_i'', \mathbf{p}_{-i})$, then for any λ with $0 < \lambda < 1$,*

$$\mathsf{V}_i(\lambda p_i' + (1-\lambda)p_i'', \mathbf{p}_{-i}) \quad > \quad \lambda \mathsf{V}_i(p_i', \mathbf{p}_{-i}) + (1-\lambda)\mathsf{V}_i(p_i'', \mathbf{p}_{-i}).$$

Note that E-strict concavity is different from the *strict concavity* formulated in [12, Section 2], and denoted here as FP-strict concavity, by using the *payoff distribution* P_i, which is the probability distribution on the costs induced by a mixed strategy p_i and a partial mixed profile $\mathbf{p}_{-i}$.[††] A closure property of E-strict concavity follows.

[††]In Appendix A, we provide a counterexample to demonstrate that the valuation $\mathsf{E}+\mathsf{Var}$ is *not* FP-strictly concave.

Corollary 2.2 *Fix an arbitrary pair of an* E*-strictly concave valuation* $\mathsf{V}^{(1)}$ *and a concave valuation* $\mathsf{V}^{(2)}$*. Then, for any* λ*, with* $0 < \lambda \leq 1$*, the valuation* $\mathsf{V} = \lambda\,\mathsf{V}^{(1)} + (1-\lambda)\,\mathsf{V}^{(2)}$ *is* E*-strictly concave.*

We observe:

Lemma 2.3 *The valuations* $\mathsf{E} + \gamma \cdot \mathsf{Var}$ *and* $\mathsf{E} + \gamma \cdot \mathsf{SD}$*, with* $\gamma > 0$*, are* E*-strictly concave.*

Proof: Fix a game G and a player $i \in [n]$. Recall that Var and SD are concave in the mixed strategy p_i. Also,

$$\mathsf{Var}_i\left(p_i, \mathbf{p}_{-i}\right) \;=\; \sum_{\mathbf{s}\in\mathcal{S}} \mathbf{p}(\mathbf{s})\,\mu_i^2(\mathbf{s}) - \left(\sum_{\ell\in\sigma(p_i)} p_i(\ell)\,\mathsf{E}_i\left(p_i^\ell, \mathbf{p}_{-i}\right)\right)^2 ;$$

so, the non-linear term in the mixed strategy p_i is a function in the variables $\mathsf{E}_i\left(p_i^\ell, \mathbf{p}_{-i}\right)$, with $\ell \in \sigma(p_i)$. Assume that there are strategies $r, t \in \sigma(p_i)$ such that $\mathsf{E}_i\left(p_i^r, \mathbf{p}_{-i}\right) \neq \mathsf{E}_i\left(p_i^t, \mathbf{p}_{-i}\right)$. Since the function $\widehat{\nu}(x) = -x^2$ is strictly concave, we get that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathsf{Var}_i\left(p_i, \mathbf{p}_{-i}\right) \\
> \;& \sum_{\mathbf{s}\in\mathcal{S}} \mathbf{p}(\mathbf{s})\mu_i^2(\mathbf{s}) - \sum_{\ell\in\sigma(p_i)} p_i(\ell)\,\mathsf{E}_i^2\left(p_i^\ell, \mathbf{p}_{-i}\right) \\
= \;& \sum_{\ell\in\sigma(p_i)} p_i(\ell) \sum_{\mathbf{s}_{-i}\in\mathcal{S}_{-i}} \mathbf{p}\left(\mathbf{s}_{-i}\right)\cdot\mu_i^2\left(p_i^\ell, \mathbf{s}_{-i}\right) - \sum_{\ell\in\sigma(p_i)} p_i(\ell)\,\mathsf{E}_i^2\left(p_i^\ell, \mathbf{p}_{-i}\right) \\
= \;& \sum_{\ell\in\sigma(p_i)} p_i(\ell) \left(\sum_{\mathbf{s}_{-i}\in\mathcal{S}_{-i}} \mathbf{p}\left(\mathbf{s}_{-i}\right)\cdot\mu_i^2\left(p_i^\ell, \mathbf{s}_{-i}\right) - \mathsf{E}_i^2\left(p_i^\ell, \mathbf{p}_{-i}\right)\right) \\
= \;& \sum_{\ell\in\sigma(p_i)} p_i(\ell)\mathsf{Var}_i\left(p_i^\ell, \mathbf{p}_{-i}\right) ,
\end{aligned}$$

as needed. Now, SD is E-strictly concave as the square root of Var. ■

By Corollary 2.2 and Lemma 2.3, it follows:

Corollary 2.4 *The valuation* $\mathsf{V} = \lambda(\mathsf{E} + \gamma \cdot \mathsf{Var}) + (1-\lambda)\mathsf{V}^\nu$*, with* $0 < \lambda \leq 1$*, where* ν *is increasing and strictly convex, and with* $\gamma > 0$*, is* E*-strictly concave.*

3 Equilibria and Their Properties

3.1 V-Equilibrium

Fix a player $i \in [n]$. The pure strategy p_i^ℓ is a V_i*-best pure response* to a partial mixed profile $\mathbf{p}_{-i}$ if

$$\mathsf{V}_i\left(p_i^\ell, \mathbf{p}_{-i}\right) \;=\; \min\left\{\mathsf{V}_i\left(p_i^{\ell'}, \mathbf{p}_{-i}\right) \mid \ell' \in S_i\right\} ;$$

so, the pure strategy p_i^ℓ minimizes the valuation $\mathsf{V}_i(., \mathbf{p}_{-i})$ of player i over her pure strategies. The mixed strategy p_i is a V_i-*best response* to $\mathbf{p}_{-i}$ if

$$\mathsf{V}_i(p_i, \mathbf{p}_{-i}) \quad = \quad \min\{\mathsf{V}_i(p_i', \mathbf{p}_{-i}) \mid p_i' \in \Delta(S_i)\} \ ;$$

so, the mixed strategy p_i minimizes the valuation $\mathsf{V}_i(., \mathbf{p}_{-i})$ of player i over her mixed strategies. The mixed profile $\mathbf{p}$ is a V-*equilibrium* if for each player i, the mixed strategy p_i is a V_i-best response to $\mathbf{p}_{-i}$; so, no player could unilaterally deviate to another mixed strategy to reduce her cost. Denote as $\exists\mathsf{V}$-EQUILIBRIUM the algorithmic problem of deciding, given a game G, the existence of a V-equilibrium for G^{V}.

3.2 The Optimal-Value Property

We show:

Proposition 3.1 (The Optimal-Value Property) *Fix a game* G*, a player* $i \in [n]$ *and a partial mixed profile* $\mathbf{p}_{-i}$*. Assume that* (A.1) *the valuation* $\mathsf{V}_i(p_i, \mathbf{p}_{-i})$ *is concave in* p_i*, and* (A.2) $\widehat{p}_i$ *is a* V_i*-best response to* $\mathbf{p}_{-i}$*. Then, for any mixed strategy* q_i *with* $\sigma(q_i) \subseteq \sigma(\widehat{p}_i)$*,* $\mathsf{V}_i(q_i, \mathbf{p}_{-i}) = \mathsf{V}_i(\widehat{p}_i, \mathbf{p}_{-i})$*.*

Proof: Set $A := \mathsf{V}_i(\widehat{p}_i, \mathbf{p}_{-i})$. Since $\widehat{p}_i$ is a V_i-best response to $\mathbf{p}_i$, it follows that $\mathsf{V}_i(q_i, \mathbf{p}_{-i}) \geq A$ for each mixed strategy $q_i \in \Delta(S_i)$ with $\sigma(q_i) \subseteq \sigma(\widehat{p}_i)$. Assume, by way of contradiction, that there is a mixed strategy $q_i \in \Delta(S_i)$ with $\sigma(q_i) \subseteq \sigma(p_i)$ such that $\mathsf{V}_i(q_i, \mathbf{p}_{-i}) > A$.

Denote as $\Delta(\sigma(\widehat{p}_i))$ the set of mixed strategies for player i with supports contained in $\sigma(\widehat{p}_i)$; so, $\Delta(\sigma(\widehat{p}_i))$ is a subspace in $[0,1]^{|\sigma(\widehat{p}_i)|}$.

For each $\lambda \in [0,1]$, the strategies $\lambda\widehat{p}_i + (1-\lambda)q_i$ form a line segment in $\Delta(\sigma(\widehat{p}_i))$. Extend this line segment to some strategy $\widehat{q}_i \in \Delta(\sigma(\widehat{p}_i))$ with $\widehat{q}_i \neq \widehat{p}_i$ so that $\widehat{p}_i$ is an interior point on the line segment connecting q_i and $\widehat{q}_i$. The extension is possible since $\widehat{p}_i(j) > 0$ for each strategy $j \in \sigma(\widehat{p}_i)$, so that $\widehat{p}_i$ is an interior point in $\Delta(\sigma(\widehat{p}_i))$. Since $\widehat{p}_i$ is a V_i-best response to $\mathbf{p}_{-i}$, it follows that $\mathsf{V}_i(\widehat{q}_i, \mathbf{p}_{-i}) \geq A$. So, there are points $\widehat{p}_i$, q_i, $\widehat{q}_i$ so that:

- $\widehat{p}_i$ is an interior point on the line segment connecting q_i and $\widehat{q}_i$.
- $\mathsf{V}_i(\widehat{p}_i, \mathbf{p}_{-i}) = A$, $\mathsf{V}_i(q_i, \mathbf{p}_{-i}) > A$ and $\mathsf{V}_i(\widehat{q}_i, \mathbf{p}_{-i}) \geq A$.

A contradiction to the concavity of $\mathsf{V}_i(., \mathbf{p}_{-i})$. ■

3.3 The Strong Equilibrium and Weak Equilibrium Properties

The mixed profile $\mathbf{p}$ has the *Strong Equilibrium* property [22, Section 2.6] for player i in the game G^{V} if for each strategy $\ell \in \sigma(p_i)$,

$$\mathsf{V}_i\left(p_i^{\ell}, \mathbf{p}_{-i}\right) \quad = \quad \min\left\{\mathsf{V}_i\left(p_i^{\ell'}, \mathbf{p}_{-i}\right) \mid \ell' \in S_i\right\} ;$$

so, each strategy in the support of player i is a V_i-best pure response to the partial mixed profile $\mathbf{p}_{-i}$. Clearly, the *Optimal-Value* property for player i implies the *Strong Equilibrium* property for player i; Proposition 3.1 extends [22, Proposition 2.1], establishing the *Strong Equilibrium* property with the same assumptions.

The mixed profile $\mathbf{p}$ has the *Weak Equilibrium* property [22, Section 2.6] for player $i \in [n]$ in the game G^{V} if for each pair of strategies $\ell, \ell' \in \sigma(p_i)$, $\mathsf{V}_i\left(p_i^{\ell}, \mathbf{p}_{-i}\right) = \mathsf{V}_i\left(p_i^{\ell'}, \mathbf{p}_{-i}\right)$. The mixed profile $\mathbf{p}$ has the *Weak Equilibrium* property [22, Section 2.6] in G^{V} if it has the *Weak Equilibrium* property for each player $i \in [n]$ in G^{V}. (So, *Strong Equilibrium* implies *Weak Equilibrium*.)

3.4 The Weak-Equilibrium-for-Expectation Property

We introduce:

Definition 3.1 (The Weak-Equilibrium-for-Expectation Property) *The valuation V has the Weak-Equilibrium-for-Expectation property if the following condition holds for every game G: For each player $i \in [n]$, if p_i is a V_i-best-response to $\mathbf{p}_{-i}$, then $\mathbf{p}$ has the Weak Equilibrium property for player i in the game G^{E}: for each pair of strategies $\ell, \ell' \in \sigma(p_i)$, $\mathsf{E}_i\left(p_i^{\ell}, \mathbf{p}_{-i}\right) = \mathsf{E}_i\left(p_i^{\ell'}, \mathbf{p}_{-i}\right)$.*

We now prove that E-strict concavity implies the *Weak-Equilibrium-for-Expectation* property:

Proposition 3.2 *Take a player $i \in [n]$ where V_i is E-strictly concave. Then, V has the Weak-Equilibrium-for-Expectation property for player i.*

Proof: Assume, by way of contradiction, that V does *not* have the *Weak-Equilibrium-for-Expectation* property for player i. Then, there is a game G, a partial mixed profile $\mathbf{p}_{-i}$ and a mixed strategy p_i which is a V_i-best-response to $\mathbf{p}_{-i}$ such that for some strategies $r, t \in \sigma(p_i)$, $\mathsf{E}_i\left(p_i^r, \mathbf{p}_{-i}\right) \neq \mathsf{E}_i\left(p_i^t, \mathbf{p}_{-i}\right)$. Since V_i is E-strictly concave, this implies that

$$\mathsf{V}_i\left(\frac{1}{2}p_i^r + \frac{1}{2}p_i^t, \mathbf{p}_{-i}\right) \quad > \quad \frac{1}{2}\mathsf{V}_i\left(p_i^r, \mathbf{p}_{-i}\right) + \frac{1}{2}\mathsf{V}_i\left(p_i^t, \mathbf{p}_{-i}\right) .$$

Since V_i is concave, the *Optimal-Value* property (Proposition 3.1) implies that

$$\mathsf{V}_i\left(\frac{1}{2}p_i^r + \frac{1}{2}p_i^t, \mathbf{p}_{-i}\right) \quad = \quad \mathsf{V}_i\left(p_i^r, \mathbf{p}_{-i}\right) \quad = \quad \mathsf{V}_i\left(p_i^t, \mathbf{p}_{-i}\right) .$$

A contradiction. ■

By Lemma 2.3 and Corollary 2.4, Proposition 3.2 immediately implies:

Corollary 3.3 *Fix an* $(\mathsf{E}+\mathsf{R})$*-valuation* V*, where* (1) $\mathsf{R}=\gamma\cdot\mathsf{Var}$*, or* (2) $\mathsf{R}=\gamma\cdot\mathsf{SD}$*, or* (3) $\mathsf{V}=\lambda(\mathsf{E}+\gamma\cdot\mathsf{Var})+(1-\lambda)\mathsf{V}^{\nu}$*, with* $0<\lambda\leq 1$*, where* ν *is increasing and strictly convex, and with* $\gamma>0$*. Then,* V *has the Weak-Equilibrium-for-Expectation property.*

We now turn to a particular concave valuation and exploit the *Optimal-Value* property (Proposition 3.1) to prove:

Proposition 3.4 *Fix a player* $i\in[n]$*, and consider the concave valuation*

$$\mathsf{V}_i \;=\; \alpha_0\cdot\mathsf{E}_i+\sum_{2\leq k\leq \ell | k \text{ is even}}\alpha_k\cdot\mathsf{kM}_i\,,$$

for some constants $\alpha_k\geq 0$*,* $0\leq k\leq\ell$*. Then,* V_i *has the Weak-Equilibrium-for-Expectation property for player* i*.*

Proof: Fix a game G. Clearly, for a mixed profile $\mathbf{p}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathsf{2kM}_i(\mathbf{p})\\
=\;&\sum_{\mathbf{s}\in S}\left(\mu_i(\mathbf{s})-\mathsf{E}_i(\mathbf{p})\right)^{2k}p(\mathbf{s})\\
=\;&\sum_{\mathbf{s}\in S}\left(\sum_{t=0}^{2k}(-1)^t\binom{2k}{t}\left(\mu_i(\mathbf{s})\right)^t\left(\mathsf{E}_i(\mathbf{p})\right)^{2k-t}\right)p(\mathbf{s})\\
=\;&\sum_{t=0}^{2k}(-1)^t\binom{2k}{t}\left(\sum_{\mathbf{s}\in S}\left(\mu_i(\mathbf{s})\right)^t p(\mathbf{s})\right)\left(\mathsf{E}_i(\mathbf{p})\right)^{2k-t}\\
=\;&\underbrace{\sum_{t=2}^{2k}(-1)^t\binom{2k}{t}\left(\sum_{\mathbf{s}\in S}\left(\mu_i(\mathbf{s})\right)^t p(\mathbf{s})\right)\left(\mathsf{E}_i(\mathbf{p})\right)^{2k-t}}_{\text{polynomial of degree bounded by } 2k-1 \text{ in } \mathbf{p}}-\underbrace{(2k-1)\left(\mathsf{E}_i(\mathbf{p})\right)^{2k}}_{\text{polynomial of degree } 2k}\;.
\end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\mathsf{V}_i(\mathbf{p}) \;=\; \alpha_0\cdot\mathsf{E}_i(\mathbf{p})+\sum_{2\leq k\leq\ell}\alpha_{2l}\cdot\mathsf{2lM}\,,$$

so that $\mathsf{V}_i(\mathbf{p})$ is the sum of *(i)* the highest-degree term $-(2\ell-1)\left(\mathsf{E}_i(\mathbf{p})\right)^{2\ell}$, which is a polynomial of degree 2ℓ in $\mathbf{p}$, and *(ii)* a polynomial of degree bounded by $2\ell-1$ in $\mathbf{p}$. Since $\mathsf{V}_i(\mathbf{p})$ is a concave polynomial in $\mathbf{p}$, the *Optimal-Value* property (Proposition 3.1) implies that $\mathsf{V}_i(\mathbf{p})$ is a *constant* polynomial in $\mathbf{p}$. Hence, it follows that $-(2\,\ell-1)\cdot\left(\mathsf{E}_i(\mathbf{p})\right)^{2\,\ell}$ is a constant polynomial in $\mathbf{p}$; thus, so is $\mathsf{E}_i(\mathbf{p})$. The *Weak-Equilibrium-for-Expectation* property for player i follows. ■

Brautbar *et al.* [5, Section 3.1] study a class of valuations, coming from the *Mean-Variance* paradigm of Markowitz [21] and termed as *Mean-Variance Preference Functions*; we rephrase their definition [5, Definition 1] to fit into the adopted setting of minimization games:

Definition 3.2 ([5]) *Fix a player $i \in [n]$. A Mean-Variance Preference Function is a valuation $\mathsf{V}_i(p_i, \mathbf{p}_{-i}) := \mathsf{G}_i(\mathsf{E}_i(p_i, \mathbf{p}_{-i}), \mathsf{Var}_i(p_i, \mathbf{p}_{-i}))$ which satisfies:*

(1) *$\mathsf{V}_i(p_i, \mathbf{p}_{-i})$ is concave in p_i.*

(2) *G_i is non-decreasing in its first argument ($\mathsf{E}_i(p_i, \mathbf{p}_{-i})$).*

(3) *Fix a partial mixed profile $\mathbf{p}_{-i}$ and a nonempty convex subset $\Delta \subseteq \Delta_i = \Delta(S_i)$ such that $\mathsf{V}_i(p_i, \mathbf{p}_{-i})$ is constant on Δ. Then, both $\mathsf{E}_i(p_i, \mathbf{p}_{-i})$ and $\mathsf{Var}_i(p_i, \mathbf{p}_{-i})$ are constant on Δ.*

So, a Mean-Variance Preference Function simultaneously generalizes and restricts the $(\mathsf{E} + \mathsf{R})$-valuations; it generalizes sum to G but restricts R to Var. Note that Condition (3) in Definition 3.2 may be seen as a generalization of the *Weak-Equilibrium-for-Expectation* property conditioned on the assumption that $\mathsf{V}_i(p_i, \mathbf{p}_{-i})$ is constant on a nonempty convex set $\Delta \subseteq \Delta_i$. It is proved in [5, Claim 1] that $\mathsf{E} + \mathsf{Var}$ is a Mean-Variance Preference Function. Since $\mathsf{E} + \mathsf{Var}$ is E-strictly concave (Lemma 2.3) and has the *Optimal-Value* property (Proposition 3.1), their established Condition (3) is a special case of our general result that every E-strictly concave valuation has the *Weak-Equilibrium-for-Expectation* property (Proposition 3.2).

4 Two Strategies

4.1 Player-Specific Scheduling Games

A *player-specific scheduling game* [22, Section 3] is equipped with an integer *weight* $\omega(i, i', \ell)$ for each triple of a player $i \in [n]$, a player $i' \in [n]$ and a strategy $\ell \in S_i$, also called *link,* with $S_1 = \ldots = S_n = [m]$; $\omega(i, i', \ell)$ represents the load due to player i' incurred to player i on link ℓ. Given the collection of weights $\{\omega(i, i', \ell)\}_{i,i' \in [n], \ell \in [m]}$, the cost function μ_i is defined by $\mu_i(\mathbf{s}) = \sum_{i' \in [n] \mid s_{i'} = s_i} \omega(i, i', s_i)$. In a *player-specific scheduling game on two ordered links* 1 *and* 2 [22, Section 5.2.2], for each pair of players $i, i' \in [n]$, either $\omega(i, i', 1) = \omega(i, i', 2) = 0$ or $\omega(i, i', 1) < \omega(i, i', 2)$.

We derive a combinatorial formula for the *k-moment* valuation of the cost of a player choosing a link ℓ in a player-specific scheduling game. The formula takes the form of a *partition polynomial* [3]: a multivariable polynomial defined by a sum over partitions of the integer k. The formula uses the function $\mathsf{f} : [0, 1] \times \mathbb{N}_0 \to \mathbb{R}$ with

$$\mathsf{f}(x, j) \quad := \quad (-x)^j (1 - x) + (1 - x)^j x \,.$$

Note that

$$\mathsf{f}(x,j) \;=\; \begin{cases} x(1-x)\left(x^{j-1}+(1-x)^{j-1}\right), & \text{for an even integer } j \geq 2 \\ x(1-x)\left(-x^{j-1}+(1-x)^{j-1}\right), & \text{for an odd integer } j \geq 3 \end{cases} .$$

The following simple claim follows by inspection.

Lemma 4.1 *The function* f *has the following properties:*

1. $\mathsf{f}(x,0) = 1$ *for all* $x \in [0,1]$.
   $\mathsf{f}(x,1) = 0$ *for all* $x \in [0,1]$.
   $\mathsf{f}(0,j) = \mathsf{f}(1,j) = 0$ *for all integers* $j \geq 0$.

2. *For an even integer* $j \geq 2$*:*
   $\mathsf{f}(x,j) > 0$ *for all* $0 < x < 1$.
   $\mathsf{f}(x,j) = \mathsf{f}(1-x,j)$ *for all* $x \in [0,1]$.

3. *For an odd integer* $j \geq 3$*:*
   $\mathsf{f}\left(\frac{1}{2},j\right) = 0$.
   $\mathsf{f}(x,j) > 0$ *for all* $0 < x < \frac{1}{2}$.
   $\mathsf{f}(x,j) < 0$ *for all* $\frac{1}{2} < x < 1$.
   $\mathsf{f}(x,j) = -\mathsf{f}(1-x,j)$ *for all* $x \in [0,1]$.

We show:

Proposition 4.2 *Consider a player-specific scheduling game with* n *players. Then, for each player* $i \in [n]$*, for a link* $\ell \in [m]$ *and a mixed profile* $\mathbf{p}$*,*

$$\mathsf{kM}_i\left(p_i^\ell, \mathbf{p}_{-i}\right) \;=\; \sum_{\substack{\langle r_1,\ldots,r_n\rangle \in \mathbb{N}_0^n \mid \\ \sum_{j\in[n]} r_j = k, r_i = 0 \\ \& \, \forall j \in [n] : r_j \neq 1}} \frac{k!}{r_1!\ldots r_n!} \prod_{j\in[n]\setminus\{i\}} \mathsf{f}\left(p_j(\ell), r_j\right) \left(\omega(i,j,\ell)\right)^{r_j} .$$

Proof: We shall first consider the special cases $k = 0$ and $k = 1$.

The case $k = 0$:
Clearly, $\mathsf{0M}_i\left(p_i^\ell, \mathbf{p}_{-i}\right) = \sum_{\mathbf{s}\in S} \left(\mu_i(\mathbf{s}) - \mathsf{E}_i(\mathbf{p})\right)^0 p(\mathbf{s}) = \sum_{\mathbf{s}\in S} p(\mathbf{s}) = 1$. The formula has value

$$\sum_{\substack{r_1,\ldots,r_n \mid \\ \sum_{j\in[n]} r_j = 0, r_i = 0 \\ \& \, \forall j \in [n] : r_j \neq 1}} \frac{0!}{r_1!\ldots r_n!} \prod_{j\in[n]\setminus\{i\}} \mathsf{f}\left(p_j(\ell), r_j\right) \left(\omega(i,j,\ell)\right)^{r_j} \;=\; 1 .$$

The case $k = 1$: Clearly,

$$\mathsf{1M}_i\left(p_i^\ell, \mathbf{p}_{-i}\right) \quad = \quad \sum_{\mathbf{s}\in S} \left(\mu_i(\mathbf{s}) - \mathsf{E}_i(\mathbf{p})\right)^1 \, p(\mathbf{s}) \quad = \quad 0\,.$$

The value of the formula is

$$\sum_{\substack{r_1,\ldots,r_n \mid \\ \sum_{j\in[n]} r_j = 1, r_i = 0 \\ \&\, \forall j \in [n] : r_j \neq 1}} \frac{1!}{r_1!\ldots r_n!} \prod_{j\in[n]\setminus\{i\}} \mathsf{f}\left(p_j(\ell), r_j\right) \left(\omega(i,j,\ell)\right)^{r_j} \quad = \quad 0\,,$$

since there is no term to add.

Assume now that $k \geq 2$. The proof is by induction on the number of players n. For the basis case where $n = 1$, $\mathsf{kM}_1(p_1^\ell, .) = 0$, and 0 is also the value given by the formula (since $r_1 = 0$ implies $\sum_j r_j \neq k$, and there is no term to add).

Assume inductively that the formula holds for $n-1$ players. For the induction step, we shall establish the formula for n players. Without loss of generality, fix $i := 1$. For simplicity, write p_j and ω_j for $p_j(\ell)$ and $\omega(i,j,\ell)$, respectively. For any integer $t \leq k$, denote as $\mathbf{p} \mid t$ the restriction of $\mathbf{p}$ to the players $1,\ldots,t$; so, $\mathbf{p} \mid n = \mathbf{p}$. Set $\mathsf{kM}_1(t) := \mathsf{kM}_1\left(p_1^\ell, (\mathbf{p} \mid t)_{-1}\right)$; so, $\mathsf{kM}_1(n) = \mathsf{kM}_1\left(p_1^\ell, \mathbf{p}_{-1}\right)$. Clearly,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathsf{kM}_1(n) \\
= \; & \sum_{\mathbf{s}\in S} p(\mathbf{s}) \, \left(\mu_1(\mathbf{s}) - \mathbb{E}_1(\mathbf{p})\right)^k \\
= \; & \sum_{\mathbf{s}_{-n}\in S_{-n}} p(\mathbf{s}_{-n}) \cdot \Big(\left(\mu_1(\mathbf{s}_{-n}) + w_n - \mathbb{E}_1(\mathbf{p})\right)^k \, p_n + \left(\mu_1(\mathbf{s}_{-n}) - \mathbb{E}_1(\mathbf{p})\right)^k \, (1-p_n)\Big) \\
= \; & \sum_{\mathbf{s}_{-n}\in S_{-n}} p(\mathbf{s}_{-n}) \cdot \\
& \Big(\left(\mu_1(\mathbf{s}_{-n}) + w_n - \mathbb{E}_1(\mathbf{p} \mid (n-1)) - p_n w_n\right)^k \, p_n + \left(\mu_1(\mathbf{s}_{-n}) - \mathbb{E}_1(\mathbf{p} \mid (n-1)) - p_n w_n\right)^k \, (1-p_n)\Big) \\
= \; & \sum_{\mathbf{s}_{-n}\in S_{-n}} p(\mathbf{s}_{-n}) \cdot \\
& \Big(\left(\mu_1(\mathbf{s}_{-n}) - \mathbb{E}_1(\mathbf{p} \mid (n-1)) + w_n(1-p_n)\right)^k \, p_n + \left(\mu_1(\mathbf{s}_{-n}) - \mathbb{E}_1(\mathbf{p} \mid (n-1)) - p_n w_n\right)^k \, (1-p_n)\Big)\,.
\end{aligned}$$

Set $\mathsf{B} = \mathsf{B}(\mathbf{s}_{-n}) := \mu_1(\mathbf{s}_{-n}) - \mathbb{E}_1(\mathbf{p} \mid (n-1))$. Then,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathsf{kM}_1(n) \\
= & \sum_{\mathbf{s}_{-n} \in S_{-n}} p(\mathbf{s}_{-n}) \left(\left(\mathsf{B} + (1-p_n)\, w_n\right)^k p_n + \left(\mathsf{B} - p_n w_n\right)^k (1-p_n) \right) \\
= & \sum_{\mathbf{s}_{-n} \in S_{-n}} p(\mathbf{s}_{-n}) \left(\left(\sum_{t=0}^{k} \binom{k}{t} \mathsf{B}^t (1-p_n)^{k-t} \left(w_n\right)^{k-t} \right) p_n + \left(\sum_{t=0}^{k} \binom{k}{t} \mathsf{B}^t (-p_n)^{k-t} \left(w_n\right)^{k-t} \right) (1-p_n) \right) \\
= & \sum_{\mathbf{s}_{-n} \in S_{-n}} p(\mathbf{s}_{-n}) \sum_{t=0}^{k} \binom{k}{t} \mathsf{B}^t \left(p_n (1-p_n)^{k-t} + (1-p_n)(-p_n)^{k-t} \right) \left(w_n\right)^{k-t} \\
= & \sum_{\mathbf{s}_{-n} \in S_{-n}} p(\mathbf{s}_{-n}) \sum_{t=0}^{k} \binom{k}{t} \mathsf{B}^t \mathsf{f}\left(p_n, k-t\right) \left(w_n\right)^{k-t} \\
= & \sum_{t=0}^{k} \binom{k}{t} \left(\sum_{\mathbf{s}_{-n} \in S_{-n}} p(\mathbf{s}_{-n}) \cdot \left(\mathsf{B}(\mathbf{s}_{-n})\right)^t \right) \mathsf{f}\left(p_n, k-t\right) \left(w_n\right)^{k-t} \\
= & \sum_{t=0}^{k} \binom{k}{t} \mathsf{tM}_1(n-1)\, \mathsf{f}\left(p_n, k-t\right) \left(w_n\right)^{k-t} .
\end{aligned}
$$

By induction hypothesis, it follows that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathsf{kM}_1(n) \\
= & \sum_{t=0}^{k} \binom{k}{t} \left(\sum_{\substack{r_1, \ldots, r_{n-1} \mid \\ \sum_{j \in [n-1]} r_j = t, r_1 = 0 \\ \& \, \forall j \in [n-1] : r_j \neq 1}} \frac{t!}{r_1! \ldots r_{n-1}!} \prod_{j \in [n-1] \setminus \{1\}} \mathsf{f}\left(p_j, r_j\right) \left(\omega_j\right)^{r_j} \right) \mathsf{f}\left(p_n, k-t\right) \left(w_n\right)^{k-t} \\
= & \sum_{\substack{r_1, \ldots, r_{n-1} \mid \\ \sum_{j \in [n-1]} r_j = t, r_1 = 0 \\ \& \, \forall j \in [n-1] : r_j \neq 1}} \sum_{t=0}^{k} \binom{k}{t} \frac{t!}{r_1! \ldots r_{n-1}!} \cdot \prod_{j \in [n-1] \setminus 1} \mathsf{f}\left(p_j, r_j\right) \mathsf{f}\left(p_n, k-t\right) \cdot \left(\omega_j\right)^{r_j} \left(w_n\right)^{k-t} \\
= & \sum_{\substack{r_1, \ldots, r_{n-1} \mid \\ \sum_{j \in [n-1]} r_j = t, r_1 = 0 \\ \& \, \forall j \in [n-1] : r_j \neq 1}} \sum_{t=0}^{k} \frac{k!}{r_1! \ldots r_{n-1}! (k-t)!} \cdot \prod_{j \in [n-1] \setminus \{1\}} \mathsf{f}\left(p_j, r_j\right) \mathsf{f}\left(p_n, k-t\right) \cdot \left(\omega_j\right)^{r_j} \left(w_n\right)^{k-t} \\
= & \sum_{\substack{r_1, \ldots, r_{n-1}, r_n \mid \\ \sum_{j \in [n]} r_j = k, r_1 = 0 \\ \& \, \forall j \in [n-1] : r_j \neq 1}} \frac{k!}{r_1! \ldots r_{n-1}! r_n!} \cdot \prod_{j \in [n] \setminus \{1\}} \mathsf{f}\left(p_j, r_j\right) \cdot \left(\omega_j\right)^{r_j} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Since $\mathsf{f}(p_n, r_n) = 0$ when $r_n = 1$, it follows that

$$\mathsf{kM}_1(n) \;=\; \sum_{\substack{r_1,\ldots,r_{n-1},r_n \mid \\ \sum_{j\in[n]} r_j = k, r_1 = 0 \\ \& \forall j \in [n] : r_j \neq 1}} \frac{k!}{r_1! \ldots r_n!} \cdot \prod_{j\in[n]\setminus\{1\}} \mathsf{f}\left(p_j, r_j\right) \cdot (\omega_j)^{r_j} \;,$$

as needed. By Lemma 4.1,

$$\mathsf{f}\left(p_j(1), r_j\right) \;=\; \begin{cases} \mathsf{f}\left(1 - p_j(1), r_j\right) \;, & \text{for even } r_j \\ -\mathsf{f}\left(1 - p_j(1), r_j\right) & \text{if } r_j \text{ is odd} \end{cases}$$

Since $\sum_{j\in[n]\setminus\{i\}} r_j = k$ and k is even, the number of odd r_j's is even, and this implies that $\alpha_i^1 = \alpha_i^2$. ■

4.2 The Mixed-Player-Has-Pure-Neighbors Property

We show:

Proposition 4.3 (The Mixed-Player-Has-Pure-Neighbors Property) *Fix a player-specific scheduling game on two ordered links* 1 *and* 2. *Fix an* $(\mathsf{E}+\mathsf{R})$*-valuation* V*, where* R *is either* (1) Var*, or* (2) SD*, or* (3) *a concave linear sum* $\sum_{k\in\{2,4,6,8\}} \alpha_k \cdot \mathsf{kM}$*, with* $\alpha_k \geq 0$ *for* $k \in \{2,4,6,8\}$. *Fix a* V*-equilibrium* $\mathbf{p}$ *and a player* $i \in [n]$. *Then, either* (C.1) *player* i *is pure, or* (C.2) *all players* $i' \in [n] \setminus \{i\}$ *with* $\omega(i, i', 1) \neq 0$ *are pure.*

Proof: We first prove a key property of moment valuations kM, where $k \in \{2,4,6,8\}$.

Lemma 4.4 *Fix a player-specific scheduling game on two ordered links* 1 *and* 2. *Fix the valuation* kM*, for an even integer* $k \in \{2,4,6,8\}$. *Fix a mixed profile* $\mathbf{p}$ *and a player* $i \in [n]$. *Then, one of the conditions* (C.1), (C.2) *and* (C.3) *holds:* (C.1) *Player* i *is pure.* (C.2) *All players* $i' \in [n]\setminus\{i\}$ *with* $\omega\left(i, i', 1\right) \neq 0$ *are pure.* (C.3) *Player* i *is mixed with* $\mathsf{kM}_i\left(p_i^1, \mathbf{p}_{-i}\right) < \mathsf{kM}_i\left(p_i^2, \mathbf{p}_{-i}\right)$.

For the proof of Lemma 4.4, we shall employ a combinatorial *Embracing Lemma* (Lemma 4.5) to establish that the k-moment valuation increases strictly monotone for $k \in \{6,8\}$; it seems that a different technique is needed to extend Lemma 4.4 beyond $k = 8$.

Lemma 4.5 (Embracing Lemma) *Fix a pair of odd integers* $r \geq 3$ *and* $s \geq 3$. *Fix probabilities* p *and* q *with* $0 < p < \frac{1}{2}$ *and* $\frac{1}{2} < q < 1$. *Fix a weight* w *and a pair of numbers* $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}^+$

with $\alpha \cdot \beta \geq \frac{1}{2}$. *Then, the function*

$$\begin{aligned}\mathsf{F}(y) \;\; := \;\; & \alpha \cdot \frac{1}{(r-1)!} \cdot \frac{1}{(s+1)!}\, \mathsf{f}(p, r-1) \cdot \mathsf{f}(q, s+1)\, w^{s+1} y^{r-1} \\ & + \frac{1}{r!} \cdot \frac{1}{s!}\, \mathsf{f}(p, r) \cdot \mathsf{f}(q, s)\, w^{s} y^{r} \\ & + \beta \cdot \frac{1}{(r+1)!} \cdot \frac{1}{(s-1)!}\, \mathsf{f}(p, r+1) \cdot \mathsf{f}(q, s-1)\, w^{s-1} y^{r+1}\end{aligned}$$

increases strictly monotone in y.

The *Embracing Lemma* establishes that a triple of "adjacent" partitions in the formula from Proposition 4.2 increases strictly monotone; intuitively, the terms corresponding to two of the partitions in the triple are positive and "help out" by embracing the third negative term to counterbalance its negative effect to increasing monotonicity.

Proof: The proof of Lemma 4.5 uses an elementary observation:

Observation 4.1 *Consider an odd integer* $r \geq 3$. *Then, for all* $x \in [0, 1]$,

$$\mathsf{f}(x, r-1) \cdot \mathsf{f}(x, r+1) \;\; > \;\; \left(\mathsf{f}(x, r)\right)^2 .$$

Proof: The claim amounts to

$$x^2\,(1-x)^2\left(x^{r-2} + (1-x)^{r-2}\right) \cdot \left(x^r + (1-x)^r\right) \;\; > \;\; x^2 (1-x)^2 \left((1-x)^r - x^r\right) ,$$

which holds trivially. ∎

We continue with the proof of the *Embracing Lemma*. Write

$$\mathsf{F}(y) \;\; := \;\; a \cdot y^{r-1} - b \cdot y^r + c \cdot y^{r+1} ,$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} a \;\; & := \;\; \alpha \cdot \frac{1}{(r-1)!} \cdot \frac{1}{(s+1)!}\, \mathsf{f}(p, r-1) \cdot \mathsf{f}(q, s+1)\, w^{s+1} , \\ b \;\; & := \;\; -\frac{1}{r!} \cdot \frac{1}{s!}\, \mathsf{f}(p, r) \cdot \mathsf{f}(q, s)\, w^{s} , \\ c \;\; & := \;\; \beta \cdot \frac{1}{(r+1)!} \cdot \frac{1}{(s-1)!}\, \mathsf{f}(p, r+1) \cdot \mathsf{f}(q, s-1)\, w^{s-1} . \end{aligned}$$

Note that $a, b, c > 0$. Clearly,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathsf{F}'(y) \;\; & = \;\; (r-1)\, a\, y^{r-2} - r\, b\, y^{r-1} + (r+1)\, c\, y^r \\ & = \;\; y^{r-2} \cdot \underbrace{\left((r-1)\, a - r\, b\, y + (r+1)\, c\, y^2\right)}_{:= \mathsf{h}(y)} . \end{aligned}$$

We shall prove that $\mathsf{h}'(y) > 0$ for all $y \geq 0$. Clearly,

$$\mathsf{h}'(y) \;\; = \;\; -r\,b + 2\,(r+1)\,c\,y\,,$$

and

$$\mathsf{h}''(y) \;\; = \;\; 2\,(r+1)y \;\; > \;\; 0\,.$$

Thus, $\mathsf{h}(y)$ takes its minimum value for $y_0 = \dfrac{rb}{2(r+1)c}$. Hence, it suffices to prove that $\mathsf{h}(y_0) > 0$. Clearly,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathsf{h}(y_0) &= (r-1)\,a - r\,b\,\frac{rb}{2(r+1)c} + (r+1)\,c\,\left(\frac{rb}{2(r+1)c}\right)^2 \\ &= (r-1)\,a - \frac{r^2}{4(r+1)} \cdot \frac{b^2}{c}\,;\end{aligned}$$

thus, $\mathsf{h}(y_0) > 0$ if and only if

$$\frac{4\,ac}{b^2} \;\; > \;\; \frac{r^2}{r^2-1}\,.$$

We now verify the latter condition. Note that

$$\frac{4\,ac}{b^2} \;\; = \;\; 4\,\alpha\beta \frac{(r!)^2}{(r-1)!(r+1)!}\,\frac{(s!)^2}{(s-1)!(s+1)!}\,\frac{\mathsf{f}(p,r-1)\mathsf{f}(p,r+1)}{(\mathsf{f}(p,r))^2}\,\frac{\mathsf{f}(q,s-1)\mathsf{f}(q,s+1)}{(\mathsf{f}(q,s))^2}\,.$$

By Observation 4.1, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{4\,ac}{b^2} &> 2 \cdot \frac{r}{r+1} \cdot \frac{s}{s+1} \\ &\geq \frac{r}{r+1} \cdot \frac{3}{2} \\ &\geq \frac{r^2}{r^2-1}\,,\end{aligned}$$

since $s \geq 3$ and $r \geq 3$. ■

We now continue with the proof of Lemma 4.4.

Proof: If Condition (C.1) holds, then we are done. So, assume that Condition (C.1) does *not* hold, so that player i is mixed. If Condition (C.3) holds, then we are done. So, assume that Condition (C.3) does *not* hold. Since player i is mixed, this implies that $\mathsf{kM}_i\left(p_i^1, \mathbf{p}_{-i}\right) \geq \mathsf{kM}_i\left(p_i^2, \mathbf{p}_{-i}\right)$. We shall establish Condition (C.2). We proceed by case analysis.

<u>The cases $k = 2$ and $k = 4$:</u> By Proposition 4.2, for each link $\ell \in [2]$,

$$2\mathsf{M}_i\left(p_i^\ell, \mathbf{p}_{-i}\right) \;\; = \;\; \sum_{j \in [n]\setminus\{i\} | \omega(i,j,\ell) \neq 0} \mathsf{f}\left(p_j(\ell), 2\right) \left(\omega(i,j,\ell)\right)^2$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathsf{4M}_i\left(p_i^{\ell},\mathbf{p}_{-i}\right)\\
=&\sum_{j\in[n]\setminus\{i\}|\omega(i,j,\ell)\neq 0}\mathsf{f}\left(p_j(\ell),4\right)\left(\omega(i,j,\ell)\right)^4\\
&+\\
&\sum_{j,k\in[n]\setminus\{i\},j\neq k|\omega(i,j,\ell)\neq 0,\omega(i,k,\ell)\neq 0}\mathsf{f}\left(p_j(\ell),2\right)\cdot\mathsf{f}\left(p_k(\ell),2\right)\left(\omega(i,j,\ell)\omega(i,k,\ell)\right)^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Since *(i)* $p_j(\overline{\ell})=1-p_j(\ell)$, *(ii)* $\mathsf{f}(x,2)=\mathsf{f}(1-x,2)$ for $x\in[0,1]$, & *(iii)* for each player $j\in[n]\setminus\{i\}$, $\omega(i,j,1)\neq 0$ if and only if $\omega(i,j,2)\neq 0$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\underbrace{\mathsf{2M}_i\left(p_i^1,\mathbf{p}_{-i}\right)-\mathsf{2M}_i\left(p_i^2,\mathbf{p}_{-i}\right)}_{\geq 0}\\
=&\sum_{j\in[n]\setminus\{i\}|\omega(i,j,1)\neq 0,\omega(i,j,2)\neq 0}\mathsf{f}\left(p_j(\ell),2\right)\cdot\underbrace{\left(\left(\omega(i,j,1)\right)^2-\left(\omega(i,j,2)\right)^2\right)}_{<0},
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
&\underbrace{\mathsf{4M}_i\left(p_i^1,\mathbf{p}_{-i}\right)-\mathsf{4M}_i\left(p_i^2,\mathbf{p}_{-i}\right)}_{\geq 0}\\
=&\sum_{j\in[n]\setminus\{i\}|\omega(i,j,1)\neq 0,\omega(i,j,2)\neq 0}\mathsf{f}\left(p_j(1),4\right)\cdot\underbrace{\left(\left(\omega(i,j,1)\right)^4-\left(\omega(i,j,2)\right)^4\right)}_{<0}\\
&+\sum_{j,k\in[n]\setminus\{i\},j\neq k|\omega(i,j,1)\cdot\omega(i,j,2)\cdot\omega(i,k,1)\cdot\omega(i,k,2)\neq 0}\mathsf{f}\left(p_j(1),2\right)\cdot\mathsf{f}\left(p_k(1),2\right)\\
&\cdot\underbrace{\left(\left(\omega(i,j,1)\right)^2\left(\omega(i,k,1)\right)^2-\left(\omega(i,j,2)\right)^2\left(\omega(i,k,2)\right)^2\right)}_{<0}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since the two links are ordered, it follows that for each player $j\in[n]\setminus\{i\}$, $\mathsf{f}\left(p_j(1),2\right)=\mathsf{f}\left(p_j(1),4\right)=0$, which implies that $p_j(1)=1$ and player j is pure, as needed for Condition (C.2).

For the remaining cases $k\in\{6,8\}$, we shall be establishing that kM_i increases strictly monotone in the weights. Since the two links are ordered, the inequality $\mathsf{kM}_i\left(p_i^1,\mathbf{p}_{-i}\right)\geq\mathsf{kM}_i\left(p_i^2,\mathbf{p}_{-i}\right)$ implies that for each player $j\in[n]\setminus\{i\}$ with $\omega(i,j,1)\neq 0$ and $\omega(i,j,2)\neq 0$, $\mathsf{f}\left(p_j(1),r_j\right)=\mathsf{f}\left(p_j(1),r_j\right)=0$, which implies that $p_j(1)=1$ and player j is pure, as needed for Condition (C.2). We shall be referring again to the formula from Proposition 4.2.

The case $k=6$: Note that 6 can be partitioned as 6, $(4,2)$, $(3,3)$, $(2,4)$ and $(2,2,2)$. The terms of the formula corresponding to the partitions 6 and $(2,2,2)$ have strictly positive coefficients; so, they are increasing strictly monotone in the weights. Now group together the terms of the

formula corresponding to the partitions with $(r_j, r_k) \in \{(4,2),(3,3),(2,4)\}$ in a single sum. Lemma 4.5 (with $\alpha = \beta = 1$) implies that the sum increases strictly monotone in the weights.

The case $k = 8$: The only partitions of 8 that use odd numbers are *(i)* $(5,3)$ and $(3,5)$, and *(ii)* $(3,3,2)$, $(3,2,3)$ and $(2,3,3)$. Partitions in *(i)* involve *two* strategies, while partitions in *(ii)* involve *three* strategies.

Case *(i)*: Let j and k be the two strategies with $0 < p_j(\ell) < \frac{1}{2}$ and $\frac{1}{2} < p_k(\ell) < 1$ for a link $\ell \in [2]$; so, $\mathsf{f}\left(p_j(\ell), 3\right) \cdot \mathsf{f}\left(p_k(\ell), 5\right) < 0$ and $\mathsf{f}\left(p_j(\ell), 5\right) \cdot \mathsf{f}\left(p_k(\ell), 3\right) < 0$.

Consider now the terms of the formula corresponding to the partitions with

$$(r_j, r_k) \quad \in \quad \{(6,2),(5,3),(4,4),(3,5),(2,6)\} \ .$$

First group together the terms corresponding to the partitions with

$$(r_j, r_k) \quad \in \quad \{(6,2),(5,3),(4,4)\}$$

in a single sum, and invoke Lemma 4.5 with $\alpha = 1$ and $\beta = \frac{1}{2}$; it follows that the sum increases strictly monotone in the weights. Then, group together the terms corresponding to the partitions with

$$(r_j, r_k) \quad \in \quad \{(2,6),(3,5),(4,4)\}$$

in a single sum, and invoke Lemma 4.5 with $\alpha = 1$ and $\beta = \frac{1}{2}$; it follows that the sum increases strictly monotone in the weights.

Case *(ii)*: Let j, k and t be the three strategies with $0 < p_j(1) < \frac{1}{2}$ and $\frac{1}{2} < p_k(1) < 1$ for a link $\ell \in [2]$; assume, without loss of generality, that $\frac{1}{2} < p_k(\ell) < 1$; so, $\mathsf{f}\left(p_j(\ell), 3\right) \cdot \mathsf{f}\left(p_k(\ell), 3\right) < 0$ and $\mathsf{f}\left(p_j(\ell), 3\right) \cdot \mathsf{f}\left(p_t(\ell), 3\right) < 0$, while $\mathsf{f}\left(p_j(\ell), 3\right) \cdot \mathsf{f}\left(p_t(\ell), 3\right) > 0$. Consider now the terms of the formula corresponding to the partitions with

$$(r_j, r_k, r_t) \quad \in \quad \{(4,2,2),(3,3,2),(2,4,2),(3,2,3),(2,2,4)\} \ .$$

In the same way as for Case *(i)*, Lemma 4.5 implies that the sum of the terms corresponding to these partitions increases strictly monotone in the weights. ■

We continue with the proof of Proposition 4.3. Consider the k-moment valuation kM with $k \in \{2,4,6,8\}$. So, Lemma 4.4 applies. Assume, by way of contradiction, that Condition (C.3) holds; then, $\mathsf{kM}_i\left(p_i^1, \mathbf{p}_{-i}\right) < \mathsf{kM}_i\left(p_i^2, \mathbf{p}_{-i}\right)$, which implies, by definition of R, that $\mathsf{R}_i\left(p_i^1, \mathbf{p}_{-i}\right) < \mathsf{R}_i\left(p_i^2, \mathbf{p}_{-i}\right)$. By the *Weak-Equilibrium-for-Expectation* property, $\mathsf{E}_i\left(p_i^1, \mathbf{p}_{-i}\right) = \mathsf{E}_i\left(p_i^2, \mathbf{p}_{-i}\right)$. Hence, $\mathsf{V}_i\left(p_i^1, \mathbf{p}_{-i}\right) < \mathsf{V}_i\left(p_i^2, \mathbf{p}_{-i}\right)$. Since V is concave, the *Optimal-Value* property (Proposition 3.1) implies that $\mathsf{V}_i\left(p_i^1, \mathbf{p}_{-i}\right) = \mathsf{V}_i\left(p_i^2, \mathbf{p}_{-i}\right)$. A contradiction. Hence, by Lemma 4.4, either (C.1) player i is pure, or (C.2) all players $i' \in [n] \setminus \{i\}$ with $\omega(i, i', 1) \neq 0$ are pure. ■

4.3 $\mathcal{NP}$-Hardness Result

We give an example of a player-specific scheduling game G with $n = 3$ players 0, 1 and 2 on two ordered links 1 and 2, with no V-equilibrium for an $(\mathsf{E}+\mathsf{R})$-valuation V, where R is (1) Var, or (2) SD, or (3) a concave linear sum $\sum_{k\in\{2,4,6,8\}} \alpha_k \cdot \mathsf{kM}$, with $\alpha_k \geq 0$ for $k \in \{2,4,6,8\}$. For $i \in \{0,1,2\}$ and $\ell \in [2]$, set

$$\begin{aligned} \omega(i,i,\ell) &:= 0\,; \\ \omega(i,(i+1) \bmod 3,\ell) &:= \delta_{\ell 2}\,; \\ \omega(i,(i+2) \bmod 3,\ell) &:= 2+\delta_{\ell 2}\,. \end{aligned}$$

(δ is the *Kronecker delta*: $\delta_{\ell 2} = 1$ if $\ell = 2$ and 0 otherwise.) Assume, by way of contradiction, that G has a pure equilibrium. If the three players are on the same link, then each player has cost greater than 0 and can reduce her cost by switching to the other link. If two of the players are on the same link $\ell \in [2]$ while the third player is on link $\overline{\ell}$. ($\overline{\ell}$ denotes the link other than ℓ.) Then, there is a player $i \in \{0,1,2\}$ such that player i is on link ℓ while player $(i+1)$ mod 3 is on link $\overline{\ell}$; her cost on link ℓ is $2+\delta_{\ell 2}$, and she can reduce her cost to $\delta_{\overline{\ell}\,2}$ by switching to link $\overline{\ell}$. A contradiction in both cases. Finally, assume that there is a V-equilibium $\mathbf{p}$ where some player $i \in \{0,1,2\}$ is mixed. By the *Mixed-Player-Has-Pure-Neighbors* property (Proposition 4.3), players $(i+1)$ mod 3 and $(i+2)$ mod 3 are pure. By the *Weak-Equilibrium-for-Expectation* property (Corollary 3.3 and Proposition 3.4), $\mathsf{E}_i\left(p_i^1, \mathbf{p}_{-i}\right) = \mathsf{E}_i\left(p_i^2, \mathbf{p}_{-i}\right)$ or $\sum_{i'\neq i | p_{i'}=p_{i'}^1} \omega(i,i',1) = \sum_{i'\neq i | p_{i'}=p_{i'}^2} \omega(i,i',2)$. By the definition of weights, a contradiction follows. Thus, $\exists$V-EQUILIBRIUM is non-trivial in the considered setting. We show:

Theorem 4.6 *Fix an $(\mathsf{E}+\mathsf{R})$-valuation V, where R is (1) Var, or (2) SD, or (3) a concave linear sum $\sum_{k\in\{2,4,6,8\}} \alpha_k \cdot \mathsf{kM}$, with $\alpha_k \geq 0$ for $k \in \{2,4,6,8\}$. Then, $\exists$V-EQUILIBRIUM is strongly $\mathcal{NP}$-hard for player-specific scheduling games on two ordered links.*

The proof will use a reduction from MULTIBALANCED PARTITION, a problem we introduce and show strongly $\mathcal{NP}$-complete:

I.:	$\langle n, m, \mathsf{A}\rangle$, with integers n, m and a set $\mathsf{A} = \{a_{ij} \mid i \in [n], j \in [m]\}$.
Q.:	Is there a subset $\mathsf{I} \subset [n]$ such that for each $j \in [m]$, $\sum_{i\in\mathsf{I}} a_{ij} = 3 + 2\sum_{i\notin\mathsf{I}} a_{ij}$?

We show:

Proposition 4.7 MULTIBALANCED PARTITION *is strongly $\mathcal{NP}$-complete.*

The proof of Proposition 4.7 employs a reduction from 3-DIMENSIONAL MATCHING [16, SP1]:

I.:	$\langle \mathsf{W}, \mathsf{X}, \mathsf{Y}, \mathsf{M} \rangle$, where M is a set with $\mathsf{M} \subseteq \mathsf{W} \times \mathsf{X} \times \mathsf{Y}$ and W, X and Y are disjoint sets with $\lvert\mathsf{W}\rvert = \lvert\mathsf{X}\rvert = \lvert\mathsf{Y}\rvert = q$.
Q.:	Does M contain a *matching,* i.e., a subset $\mathsf{M}' \subset \mathsf{M}$ with $\lvert\mathsf{M}'\rvert = q$ such that no two elements of M' agree in any coordinate?

Proof: Clearly, MULTIBALANCED PARTITION belongs to $\mathcal{NP}$. For the $\mathcal{NP}$-hardness we shall employ a reduction from 3-DIMENSIONAL MATCHING.[‡‡] Given an instance $\langle \mathsf{W}, \mathsf{X}, \mathsf{Y}, \mathsf{M} \rangle$ of 3-DIMENSIONAL MATCHING, with $\mathsf{W} = \{w_1, \ldots, w_q\}$, $\mathsf{X} = \{x_1, \ldots, x_q\}$, $\mathsf{Y} = \{y_1, \ldots, y_q\}$ and $\mathsf{M} = \{m_1, \ldots, m_k\}$, where for each $i \in [k]$, $m_i = (w_{\mathsf{f}(i)}, x_{\mathsf{g}(i)}, y_{\mathsf{h}(i)})$ with functions $\mathsf{f}, \mathsf{g}, \mathsf{h} : [k] \to [q]$ giving the first, second and third coordinate, respectively, of each element $m_i \in \mathsf{M}$, we construct an instance $\langle n, m, \mathsf{A} \rangle$ of MULTIBALANCED PARTITION as follows:

- $n := k + 1$ and $m := 3q$.
- For $1 \leq i \leq k$ and $1 \leq j \leq m$,

$$a_{ij} \quad := \quad \begin{cases} 1\,, & \text{if } (1 \leq j \leq q \text{ and } j = \mathsf{f}(i)) \\ & \text{or } (q+1 \leq j \leq 2q \text{ and } j - q = \mathsf{g}(i)) \\ & \text{or } (2q+1 \leq j \leq 3q \text{ and } j - 2q = \mathsf{h}(i)) \\ 0\,, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} ,$$

and for $1 \leq j \leq m$,

$$a_{k+1,j} \quad := \quad 2\, b_j\,,$$

where

$$b_j \quad := \quad \sum_{i \in [k]} a_{ij}\,.$$

We prove:

Lemma 4.8 *$\langle \mathsf{W}, \mathsf{X}, \mathsf{Y}, \mathsf{M} \rangle$ has a solution if and only if $\langle n, m, \mathsf{A} \rangle$ has a solution.*

Proof: "⇒": Assume first that $\langle \mathsf{W}, \mathsf{X}, \mathsf{Y}, \mathsf{M} \rangle$ has a solution M'. Set

$$\mathsf{I}' \quad := \quad \left\{ i \in [k] \mid m_i \in \mathsf{M}' \right\}\,.$$

Then, clearly, for each $j \in [m]$, $\sum_{i \in \mathsf{I}'} a_{ij} = 1$. Hence, for each $j \in [m]$,

$$\sum_{i \in [k] \setminus \mathsf{I}'} a_{ij} \quad = \quad \sum_{i \in [k]} a_{ij} - \sum_{i \in \mathsf{I}'} a_{ij} \quad = \quad b_j - 1\,.$$

[‡‡]The reduction is very similar to the one used in the proof of [16, Theorem 3.5].

Set now $\mathsf{I} := \mathsf{I}' \cup \{k+1\}$. Then, for each $j \in [m]$,

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i\in\mathsf{I}} a_{ij} &= \sum_{i\in\mathsf{I}'} a_{ij} + a_{k+1,j} \\ &= 1 + 2\,b_j \\ &= 3 + 2\,(b_j - 1) \\ &= 3 + 2 \sum_{i\in[k]\setminus\mathsf{I}'} a_{ij} \\ &= 3 + 2 \sum_{i\notin\mathsf{I}} a_{ij}\,,\end{aligned}$$

so that I is a solution of $\langle n, m, \mathsf{A}\rangle$.

"$\Leftarrow$": Assume now that $\langle n, m, \mathsf{A}\rangle$ has a solution I. We claim that $k+1 \in \mathsf{I}$: Assume, by way of contradiction, that $k+1 \notin \mathsf{I}$. Then, for each $j \in [m]$,

$$\begin{aligned} & 3 + 2 \sum_{i\notin\mathsf{I}} a_{ij} \\ \geq\ & 3 + 2\,a_{k+1,j} && \text{(since } k+1 \notin \mathsf{I}\text{)} \\ =\ & 3 + 4b_j && \text{(by definition of } a_{k+1,j}\text{)} \\ >\ & b_j \\ =\ & \textstyle\sum_{i\in[k]} a_{ij} && \text{(by definition of } b_j\text{)} \\ \geq\ & \textstyle\sum_{i\in\mathsf{I}} a_{ij}\,, \end{aligned}$$

a contradiction to the assumption that I is a solution of $\langle n, m, \mathsf{A}\rangle$. So, $k+1 \in \mathsf{I}$.

Fix now an arbitrary $j \in [m]$. Set $\Delta_j := \sum_{i\in\mathsf{I}\setminus\{k+1\}} a_{ij}$. Since I is a solution of $\langle n, m, \mathsf{A}\rangle$,

$$\sum_{i\in\mathsf{I}} a_{ij} \;=\; 3 + 2 \sum_{i\notin\mathsf{I}} a_{ij}\,.$$

Since $k+1 \in \mathsf{I}$, this implies that

$$a_{k+1,j} + \sum_{i\in\mathsf{I}\setminus\{k+1\}} a_{ij} \;=\; 3 + 2 \left(\sum_{i\in[k]} a_{ij} - \sum_{i\in\mathsf{I}\setminus\{k+1\}} a_{ij} \right).$$

Hence,

$$2\,b_j + \Delta_j \;=\; 3 + 2\,(b_j - \Delta_j)\,.$$

It follows that $\Delta_j = 1$, so that $\mathsf{I} \setminus \{k+1\}$ is a solution of $\langle \mathsf{W}, \mathsf{X}, \mathsf{Y}, \mathsf{M}\rangle$. ■

Lemma 4.8 establishes the reduction for the $\mathcal{NP}$-hardness; since the number involved in the reduction are polynomially bounded, strong $\mathcal{NP}$-hardness follows. ■

For the proof of the reduction for Theorem 4.6, we shall use the *Mixed-Player-Has-Pure-Neighbors* property (Proposition 4.3) to identify the mixed players; in turn, we shall apply the *Weak-Equilibrium-for-Expectation* property to the mixed players to obtain a solution to MULTIBALANCED PARTITION or a V-equilibrium. We continue with the proof of Theorem 4.6.

Proof: We shall employ a reduction from MULTIBALANCED PARTITION. Given an instance $\langle n, m, \mathsf{A}\rangle$ of MULTIBALANCED PARTITION, we construct an instance $\langle \mathsf{G}\rangle$ of $\exists$V-EQUILIBRIUM as follows. G is a player-specific scheduling game on two ordered links with $n + 5m$ players in the player set $\Pi := [n] \cup \{[k, j] \mid k \in [m], j \in \{0, \ldots, 4\}\}$. Set $M := \max_k \sum_{j\in[n]} a_{kj}$. We assume that $M \geq 4$. We now define the weights $\omega(\pi_1, \pi_2, \ell)$ where $\pi_1, \pi_2 \in \Pi$ and $\ell \in [2]$, where δ is the *Kronecker delta*: $\delta_{\ell\ell'} = 1$ if $\ell = \ell'$ and 0 otherwise.

1. $\underline{\pi_1 = [k, j] \text{ with } k \in [m] \text{ and } j \in \{0, \ldots, 3\}}$: Then,

$$\omega([k, j], \pi_2, \ell) \quad := \quad \begin{cases} M + \delta_{\ell 2}\,, & \text{if } \pi_2 = [k, i] \text{ with } i = 4 \text{ or } i \neq (j + 1) \bmod 4 \\ M - 4 + \delta_{\ell 2}\,, & \text{if } \pi_2 = [k, (j + 1) \bmod 4] \\ 0\,, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} .$$

2. $\underline{\pi_1 = [k, 4] \text{ with } k \in [m]}$: Then,

$$\omega([k, 4], \pi_2, \ell) \quad := \quad \begin{cases} M + \delta_{\ell 2}\,, & \text{if } \pi_2 = [k, i] \text{ with } i \in [4] \\ a_{kj}\,, & \text{if } \pi_2 = j \in [n] \text{ and } \ell = 1 \\ 2\,a_{kj}\,, & \text{if } \pi_2 = j \in [n] \text{ and } \ell = 2 \\ 0\,, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} .$$

3. $\underline{\pi_1 = i \in [n]}$: Then, $\omega(i, \pi_2, \ell) = 0$ for all $\pi_2 \in \Pi$ and $\ell \in [2]$.

Note that G is a player-specific scheduling game on two ordered links. We now prove:

Lemma 4.9 *In a* V*-equilibrium* $\mathbf{p}$*, for each* $k \in [m]$*, there is an index* $j \in \{0, \ldots, 4\}$ *such that player* $[k, j]$ *is non-pure.*

Proof: Assume, by way of contradiction, that there is an index $\widehat{k} \in [m]$ such that all players $[\widehat{k}, j]$ with $j \in \{0, \ldots, 4\}$ are pure; so, $p_{[\widehat{k},j]}[1] \in \{0, 1\}$ for all $j \in \{0, \ldots, 4\}$. If there are at least four players $[\widehat{k}, j]$ with $j \in \{0, \ldots, 4\}$ choosing the same link, then at least one player $[\widehat{k}, j]$ with $j \in \{0, \ldots, 3\}$ can improve her cost by switching to the other link. So, assume that there are three players $[\widehat{k}, j]$ with $j \in \{0, \ldots, 4\}$ choosing some link $\ell \in [2]$, while the remaining two players choose the other link. Then, there is an index $j_0 \in \{0, \ldots, 3\}$ such that player $[\widehat{k}, j_0]$

chooses link ℓ while player $[\widehat{k}, (j_0{+}1) \bmod 4]$ chooses link $\overline{\ell}$. So, $\mu_{[\widehat{k},j_0]}(\mathbf{p}) = 3M{+}3\delta_{\ell 2}$, and player $[\widehat{k}, j_0]$ can improve by switching to link $\overline{\ell}$ where her cost becomes $3M - 4 + 3\delta_{\overline{\ell}2} < 3M + 3\delta_{\ell 2}$. A contradiction to the assumption that $\mathbf{p}$ is a V-equilibrium. ■

We next prove:

Lemma 4.10 *In a V-equilibrium, each player $[k, j]$, with $k \in [m]$ and $j \in \{0, \ldots, 3\}$, is pure.*

Proof: Assume, by way of contradiction, that there is a non-pure player $\pi = [\widehat{k}, \widehat{j}]$ with $\widehat{k} \in [m]$ and $\widehat{j} \in \{0, \ldots, 3\}$. Then, by the *Mixed-Player-Has-Pure-Neighbors* property (Proposition 4.3), all players $[\widehat{k}, j]$ with $j \in \{0, \ldots, 4\} \setminus \{\widehat{j}\}$ are pure. By the *Weak-Equilibrium-for-Expectation* property for player π, $\mathsf{E}_\pi\left(p^1_\pi, \mathbf{p}_{-\pi}\right) = \mathsf{E}_\pi\left(p^2_\pi, \mathbf{p}_{-\pi}\right)$. For each link $\ell \in \{1, 2\}$, denote as Φ_ℓ the set of players $[\widehat{k}, j]$ with $j \in \{0, \ldots, 4\} \setminus \{\widehat{j}\}$ choosing link ℓ; set $y_\ell := 1$ if $[\widehat{k}, (\widehat{j}+1) \bmod 4] \in \Phi_\ell$ and 0 otherwise. Clearly, $|y_1 - y_2| = 1$. Then,

$$\mathsf{E}_\pi\left(p^1_\pi, \mathbf{p}_{-\pi}\right) \;=\; |\Phi_1| \cdot M - 4\, y_1\,,$$

and

$$\mathsf{E}_\pi\left(p^2_\pi, \mathbf{p}_{-\pi}\right) \;=\; |\Phi_2| \cdot (M+1) - 4\, y_2\,.$$

We proceed by case analysis.

1. Assume first that $|\Phi_1| > |\Phi_2|$. So, $|\Phi_1| \geq 3$ and $|\Phi_2| \leq 1$. Then,

   $$\mathsf{E}_\pi\left(p^1_\pi, \mathbf{p}_{-\pi}\right) \;\geq\; 3\,M - 4\,y_1 \;>\; M + 1 - 4\,y_2 \;\geq\; \mathsf{E}_\pi\left(p^2_\pi, \mathbf{p}_{-\pi}\right)\,,$$

   since $3M > M + 5 \geq M + 1 + 4\,(y_1 - y_2)$. A contradiction.

2. Assume now that $|\Phi_1| < |\Phi_2|$. So, $|\Phi_2| \geq 3$ and $|\Phi_1| \leq 1$. Then,

   $$\mathsf{E}_\pi\left(p^2_\pi, \mathbf{p}_{-\pi}\right) \;\geq\; 3\,M + 3 - 4\,y_2 \;>\; M - 4\,y_1 \;\geq\; \mathsf{E}_\pi\left(p^1_\pi, \mathbf{p}_{-\pi}\right)\,,$$

   since $3M + 3 > M + 4 \geq M + 4\,(y_2 - y_1)$. A contradiction.

3. Assume finally that $|\Phi_1| = |\Phi_2|$. Then,

   $$\mathsf{E}_\pi\left(p^1_\pi, \mathbf{p}_{-\pi}\right) \;=\; 2\,M - 4\,y_1\,,$$

   and

   $$\mathsf{E}_\pi\left(p^2_\pi, \mathbf{p}_{-\pi}\right) \;=\; 2\,M + 2 - 4\,y_2\,.$$

   Since $\mathsf{E}_\pi\left(p^2_\pi, \mathbf{p}_{-\pi}\right) = \mathsf{E}_\pi\left(p^2_\pi, \mathbf{p}_{-\pi}\right)$, it follows that $4(y_2 - y_1) = 2$. A contradiction.

The claim follows. ■

We are now ready to prove:

Lemma 4.11 *If* G *has a* V*-equilibrium, then* $\langle n, m, \mathsf{A}\rangle$ *has a solution.*

Proof: Consider a V-equilibrium $\mathbf{p}$. By Lemmas 4.9 and 4.10, all players $[k, 4]$ with $k \in [m]$ are non-pure. Hence, the *Mixed-Player-Has-Pure-Neighbors* property (Proposition 4.3) and the definition of the weights imply together that all players $i \in [n]$ and $[k, j]$ with $k \in [m]$ and $j \in \{0, \ldots, 3\}$ are pure. Fix now an arbitrarily chosen player $\pi = [\widehat{k}, 4]$. For each link $\ell \in [2]$, denote $\mathsf{I}_\ell := \{i \in [n] \mid p_i(\ell) = 1\}$ and $\Phi_\ell := \{[\widehat{k}, j] \mid j \in \{0, \ldots, 3\} \text{ and } p_{[\widehat{k},j]}(\ell) = 1\}$. Clearly,

$$\mathsf{E}_\pi\left(p^1_\pi, \mathbf{p}_{-\pi}\right) \;=\; (1 + |\Phi_1|) \cdot M + \sum_{i \in \mathsf{I}_1} a_i \,,$$

and

$$\mathsf{E}_\pi\left(p^2_\pi, \mathbf{p}_{-\pi}\right) \;=\; (1 + |\Phi_2|) \cdot (M+1) + 2 \sum_{i \in \mathsf{I}_2} a_i \,.$$

The *Weak-Equilibrium-for-Expectation* property (Corollary 3.3 and Proposition 3.4) implies that $\mathsf{E}_\pi\left(p^1_\pi, \mathbf{p}_{-\pi}\right) = \mathsf{E}_\pi\left(p^2_\pi, \mathbf{p}_{-\pi}\right)$. By the choice of M, this implies that $|\Phi_1| = |\Phi_2| = 2$, so that

$$\sum_{i \in \mathsf{I}_1} a_i \;=\; 3 + 2 \sum_{i \in \mathsf{I}_2} a_i \,.$$

Hence, I is a solution of $\langle n, m, \mathsf{A}\rangle$. ■

We finally prove:

Lemma 4.12 *If* $\langle n, m, \mathsf{A}\rangle$ *has a solution, then* G *has a* V*-equilibrium.*

For the proof of Lemma 4.12, we shall use a particular monotonicity property of the risk valuation $\mathsf{R} = \mathsf{kM}$ with an even integer $k \geq 2$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{\mathsf{kM}}(a, b, q) &= (1-q) \cdot (a - ((1-q) \cdot a + q \cdot b))^k + q \cdot (b - ((1-q) \cdot a + q \cdot b))^k \\
&= (1-q) \cdot q^k \cdot (b-a)^k + q \cdot (1-q)^k \cdot (b-a)^k \\
&= q \cdot (1-q) \cdot (b-a)^k \cdot \left(q^{k-1} + (1-q)^{k-1}\right) \,.
\end{aligned}$$

This implies that all valuations R addressed in Theorem 4.6 incur $\widehat{\mathsf{R}}(a, b, q)$ which increases monotonically in $b-a$ for a fixed probability $q \in (0, 1)$. In fact, the function $\widehat{\mathsf{R}}(a, b, q)$ with $a \leq b$ is a function $\widetilde{\mathsf{R}}(b-a, q) := \widehat{\mathsf{R}}(a, b, q)$ in $b-a$; the function $\widetilde{\mathsf{R}}(b-a, q)$ increases monotonically in $b-a$ for a fixed $q \in (0, 1)$ and satisfies $\widetilde{\mathsf{R}}(b-a, q) = \widetilde{\mathsf{R}}(b-a, 1-q)$. For the proof of Lemma 4.12, we shall refer to these two properties together as the *Two-Values Risk-Monotonicity* property. We continue with the proof of Lemma 4.12.

Proof: Consider a solution $\mathsf{I} \subset [n]$ of $\langle n, m, \mathsf{A} \rangle$. Define a mixed profile $\mathbf{p}$ as follows:

- For each $i \in [n]$, $p_i(1) := 1$ if $i \in \mathsf{I}$, and 0 otherwise.
- For $1 \leq k \leq m$: $p_{[k,0]}(1), p_{[k,2]}(1) := 1$; $p_{[k,1]}(1), p_{[k,3]}(1) := 0$; $p_{[k,4]}(2) := x \in (0,1)$.

We now prove that x can be chosen so that $\mathbf{p}$ is a V-equilibrium. We proceed by case analysis.

1. Players $i \in [n]$ cannot improve since $\omega(i, \pi, \ell) = 0$ for all $\pi \in \Pi$ and $\ell \in [2]$.
2. Consider now players $[k, r]$ with $k \in [m]$ and $r \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$. Note that for fixed k and r, $\mu_{[k,r]}(\mathbf{s})$ takes only two values over all profiles $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{S}$ with $\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{s}) > 0$. (Observe for this that player $\pi = [k, 4]$ is the only player with $0 < p_\pi(1) < 1$ and $\omega([k, r], \pi, \ell) \neq 0$ for $r \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$ and $\ell \in [2]$.) Denote as A_{kr} and B_{kr} the two values taken by $\mu_{[k,r]}(\mathbf{s})$ over all profiles $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{S}$ with $\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{s}) > 0$, with $\mathsf{A}_{kr} > \mathsf{B}_{kr}$. By the cost functions and the definition of $\mathbf{p}$, we get:
   - For $r \in \{0, 2\}$: $\mathsf{A}_{kr} = 3M$ and $\mathsf{B}_{kr} = 2M$, so that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathsf{E}_{[k,r]}(\mathbf{p}) &= (1 - x) \cdot \mathsf{A}_{kr} + x \cdot \mathsf{B}_{kr} \\ &= (3 - x) \cdot M \,, \end{aligned}$$

     and, using the *Two-Values Risk-Monotonicity* property,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathsf{R}_{[k,r]}(\mathbf{p}) &= \widehat{\mathsf{R}}_{[kr]}(\mathsf{A}_{kr}, \mathsf{B}_{kr}, 1 - x) \\ &= \widehat{\mathsf{R}}_{[kr]}(3M, 2M, 1 - x) \\ &= \widetilde{\mathsf{R}}_{[kr]}(M, x) \,. \end{aligned}$$

   - For $r \in \{1, 3\}$: $\mathsf{A}_{kr} = 3(M + 1)$ and $\mathsf{B}_{kr} = 2(M + 1)$, so that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathsf{E}_{[k,r]}(\mathbf{p}) &= x \cdot \mathsf{A}_{kr} + (1 - x) \cdot \mathsf{B}_{kr} \\ &= (2 + x) \cdot (M + 1) \,, \end{aligned}$$

     and, using the *Two-Values Risk-Monotonicity* property,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathsf{R}_{[k,r]}(\mathbf{p}) &= \widehat{\mathsf{R}}_{[kr]}(\mathsf{A}_{kr}, \mathsf{B}_{kr}, x) \\ &= \widehat{\mathsf{R}}_{[kr]}(3(M + 1), 2(M + 1), x) \\ &= \widetilde{\mathsf{R}}_{[kr]}(M + 1, x) \,. \end{aligned}$$

Consider now the cost of player $[k,r]$ with $r \in \{0,1,2,3\}$ when she switches to the other link. Denote as $\widehat{\mathbf{p}}$ the corresponding mixed profile. As in the case of the mixed profile $\mathbf{p}$, $\mu_{[k,r]}(\mathbf{s})$ takes only two values over all profiles $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{S}$ with $\widehat{\mathbf{p}}(\mathbf{s}) > 0$. Denote as C_{kr} and D_{kr} the two values taken by $\mu_{[k,r]}(\mathbf{s})$ over all profiles $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{S}$ with $\widehat{\mathbf{p}}(\mathbf{s}) > 0$, with $\mathsf{C}_{kr} > \mathsf{D}_{kr}$. By the cost functions and the definition of $\widehat{\mathbf{p}}$, we get:

- For $r \in \{0,2\}$: $\mathsf{C}_{kr} = 4\,(M+1) - 4 = 4M$ and $\mathsf{D}_{kr} = 3\,(M+1) - 4 = 3M - 1$, so that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathsf{E}_{[k,r]}(\widehat{\mathbf{p}}) &= x \cdot \mathsf{C}_{kr} + (1-x) \cdot \mathsf{D}_{kr} \\ &= 3M - 1 + x \cdot (M+1)\,, \end{aligned}$$

  and, using the *Two-Values Risk-Monotonicity* property,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathsf{R}_{[k,r]}(\widehat{\mathbf{p}}) &= \widehat{\mathsf{R}}_{[kr]}\,(\mathsf{C}_{kr}, \mathsf{D}_{kr}, 1-x) \\ &= \widehat{\mathsf{R}}_{[kr]}\,(4M, 3M-1, 1-x) \\ &= \widetilde{\mathsf{R}}_{[kr]}\,(M+1, x)\ . \end{aligned}$$

- For $r \in \{1,3\}$: $\mathsf{C}_{kr} = 4M - 4$ and $\mathsf{D}_{kr} = 3M - 4$, so that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathsf{E}_{[k,r]}(\widehat{\mathbf{p}}) &= x \cdot \mathsf{D}_{kr} + (1-x) \cdot \mathsf{C}_{kr} \\ &= 4M - 4 - x \cdot M\,, \end{aligned}$$

  and, using the *Two-Values Risk-Monotonicity* property,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathsf{R}_{[k,r]}(\widehat{\mathbf{p}}) &= \widehat{\mathsf{R}}_{[kr]}\,(\mathsf{C}_{kr}, \mathsf{D}_{kr}, x) \\ &= \widehat{\mathsf{R}}_{[kr]}\,(4M-4, 3M-4, x) \\ &= \widetilde{\mathsf{R}}_{[kr]}\,(M, x)\ . \end{aligned}$$

We now determine a probability $x \in (0,1)$ so that for all players $[k,r]$ with $r \in \{0,1,2,3\}$, $\mathsf{V}_{[k,r]}(\mathbf{p}) \leq \mathsf{V}_{[k,r]}(\widehat{\mathbf{p}})$. We proceed by case analysis.

- For $r \in \{0,2\}$: Then, $\mathsf{V}_{[k,r]}(\mathbf{p}) \leq \mathsf{V}_{[k,r]}(\widehat{\mathbf{p}})$ if and only if

$$(3-x) \cdot M + \widetilde{\mathsf{R}}_{[k,r]}(M,x) \quad \leq \quad 3M - 1 + x \cdot (M+1) + \widetilde{\mathsf{R}}_{[k,r]}(M+1,x)$$

  if and only if

$$1 \quad \leq \quad x \cdot (2M+1) + \widetilde{\mathsf{R}}_{[k,r]}(M+1,x) - \widetilde{\mathsf{R}}_{[k,r]}(M,x)\,.$$

- For $r \in \{1,3\}$: Then, $\mathsf{V}_{[k,r]}(\mathbf{p}) \leq \mathsf{V}_{[k,r]}(\widehat{\mathbf{p}})$ if and only if

$$(2+x)\cdot(M+1) + \widetilde{\mathsf{R}}_{[k,r]}(M+1,x) \quad \leq \quad 4M - 4 - x\cdot M + \widetilde{\mathsf{R}}_{[k,r]}(M,x)$$

if and only if

$$x\cdot(2M+1) + \widetilde{\mathsf{R}}_{[k,r]}(M+1,x) - \widetilde{\mathsf{R}}_{[k,r]}(M,x) \quad \leq \quad 2M-6\,.$$

Set

$$\mathsf{h}(x) \quad := \quad x\cdot(2M+1) + \widetilde{\mathsf{R}}_{[k,r]}(M+1,x) - \widetilde{\mathsf{R}}_{[k,r]}(M,x)\,.$$

We shall determine a probability x so that $1 \leq \mathsf{h}(x) \leq 2M-6$. (Since $M \geq 4$, $2M-6 \geq 1$.) Observe that $\mathsf{h}(0) = 0$. Set

$$\widehat{x} \quad := \quad \frac{1}{2M+1}\,.$$

By the *Two-Values Risk-Monotonicity* property, $\widetilde{\mathsf{R}}_{[k,r]}(M+1,x) > \widetilde{\mathsf{R}}_{[k,r]}(M,x)$. This implies that $\mathsf{h}(\widehat{x}) > 1$. If $\mathsf{h}(\widehat{x}) \leq 2M-6$, then set $x := \widehat{x}$ and we are done. If $\mathsf{h}(\widehat{x}) > 2M-6$, then the continuity of R implies that there is a probability $\widetilde{x} \in (0,\widehat{x})$ such that $1 \leq \mathsf{h}(\widetilde{x}) \leq 2M-6$, and we are done.

3. Finally consider players $[k,4]$ with $k \in [m]$. By the definition of $\mathbf{p}$,

$$\mathsf{E}_{[k,4]}\left(p^1_{[k,4]}, \mathbf{p}_{-[k,4]}\right) \quad = 3\,M + \textstyle\sum_{i\in\mathsf{I}} a_{ki}\,,$$

and

$$\mathsf{E}_{[k,4]}\left(p^2_{[k,4]}, \mathbf{p}_{-[k,4]}\right) \quad = 3\,(M+1) + 2\textstyle\sum_{i\notin\mathsf{I}} a_{ki}\,.$$

Since I is a solution of $\langle n, m, \mathsf{A}\rangle$, we get that

$$\mathsf{E}_{[k,4]}\left(p^1_{[k,4]}, \mathbf{p}_{-[k,4]}\right) \quad = \quad \mathsf{E}_{[k,4]}\left(p^1_{[k,4]}, \mathbf{p}_{-[k,4]}\right)\,.$$

By the *Risk-Positivity* property, this implies that $\mathsf{R}_{[k,4]}(\mathbf{p}) = 0$ so that $\mathsf{V}_{[k,4]}(\mathbf{p}) = \mathsf{E}_{[k,4]}(\mathbf{p})$. Since $\mathbf{p}$ is a fully mixed profile (since $0 < x < 1$) and V has the *Weak-Equilibrium-for-Expectation* property (Corollary 3.3 and Proposition 3.4), $\mathsf{E}_{[k,4]}(\mathbf{p})$ cannot decrease; hence, neither $\mathsf{V}_{[k,4]}(\mathbf{p})$ can.

It follows from the case analysis that $\mathbf{p}$ is a V-equilibrium. ■

Lemmas 4.11 and 4.12 establish the reduction for the $\mathcal{NP}$-hardness; since the numbers involved in the reduction are polynomially bounded, strong $\mathcal{NP}$-hardness follows. ■

5 Two Players

Consider a concave valuation V^ν, for an increasing and strictly convex function ν. Since ν^{-1} is also increasing, a mixed profile $\mathbf{p}$ is a V^ν-equilibrium for a game G if and only if $\mathbf{p}$ is an E-equilibrium for the game G^ν constructed from G by setting for each player $i \in [n]$ and profile $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{S}$, $\mu_i^\nu(\mathbf{s}) := \nu(\mu_i(\mathbf{s}))$. Since every game has an E-equilibrium [24, 25], this implies that there is a V^ν-equilibrium for G, and the associated search problem for a V^ν-equilibrium is total; it is in $\mathcal{PPAD}$ [26] for 2-players games. Nevertheless, we shall show that there are other (concave) valuations V for which deciding the existence of a V-equilibrium is strongly $\mathcal{NP}$-hard for 2-players games.

5.1 General $\mathcal{NP}$-Hardness Result

We show:

Theorem 5.1 *Fix an* $(\mathsf{E}+\mathsf{R})$*-valuation* V *such that:*

(1) V *has the Weak-Equilibrium-for-Expectation property.*

(2) *There is a polynomial time computable* δ *with* $0 < \delta \leq \frac{1}{4}$ *such that:*

(2/a) $\widehat{\mathsf{R}}(1, 1+2\delta, q) < \frac{1}{2}$ *for each probability* $q \in [0,1]$.

(2/b) $\widehat{\mathsf{V}}(1, 1+2\delta, r) < \widehat{\mathsf{V}}(1, 2, q)$ *for all* $0 \leq r \leq q \leq 1$.

(2/c) *The Crawford game* $\mathsf{G}_C(\delta)$ *with bimatrix* $\begin{pmatrix} \langle 1+\delta, 1+\delta\rangle & \langle 1, 1+2\delta\rangle \\ \langle 1, 1+2\delta\rangle & \langle 1+2\delta, 1\rangle \end{pmatrix}$ *has no* V*-equilibrium.*

Then, $\exists\mathsf{V}$-EQUILIBRIUM *is strongly* $\mathcal{NP}$*-hard for 2-players games.*

We present a general proof with a reduction involving the parameter δ from Condition (2), required to be polynomial time computable. The reduction uses the *Crawford game* $\mathsf{G}_C(\delta)$ as a "gadget"; for any δ with $0 < \delta < 1$, $\mathsf{G}_C(\delta)$ is an adapted generalization of a bimatrix game from [7, Section 4]. The parameter δ enters the reduction through $\mathsf{G}_C(\delta)$.

Specifically, the proof of Theorem 5.1 employs a reduction from SAT [16, L01]. An instance of SAT is a propositional formula ϕ in the form of a conjunction of *clauses* $\mathsf{C} = \{\mathsf{c}_1, \ldots, \mathsf{c}_k\}$ over a set of *variables* $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathsf{v}_1, \ldots, \mathsf{v}_m\}$. Denote as $\mathsf{L} = \{\ell_1, \overline{\ell}_1, \ldots, \ell_m, \overline{\ell}_m\}$ the set of *literals* corresponding to the variables in $\mathcal{V}$. We shall use lower-case letters $\mathsf{c}, \mathsf{c}_1, \mathsf{c}_2, \ldots$, $\mathsf{v}, \mathsf{v}_1, \mathsf{v}_2, \ldots$, and $\ell, \ell_1, \ell_2, \ldots$ to denote clauses from C, variables from $\mathcal{V}$ and literals from L, respectively.

Denote $\Lambda := \mathsf{C} \cup \mathcal{V} \cup \mathsf{L}$. We shall use the *Crawford set* $\mathcal{F} = \{\mathsf{f}_1, \mathsf{f}_2\}$ with two strategies f_1 and f_2; f denotes either f_1 or f_2. The cost values are chosen judiciously so as to carefully assure or exclude the existence of a V-equilibrium. We continue with the proof of Theorem 5.1.

Proof: Given an instance ϕ of SAT, construct a game $\mathsf{G} = \mathsf{G}(\phi) = \langle [2], \{S_i\}_{i\in[2]}, \{\mu_i\}_{i\in[2]} \rangle$ as follows. For each player $i \in [2]$, $S_i := \Lambda \cup \mathcal{F}$. The cost functions $\{\mu_i\}_{i\in[2]}$ are given in Figure 1.

Profile $\mathbf{s}$	Condition on $\mathbf{s}$	$\langle \mu_1(\mathbf{s}), \mu_2(\mathbf{s}) \rangle$
$\langle \ell_1, \ell_2 \rangle$	$\ell_1 \neq \overline{\ell}_2$	$\langle 1, 1 \rangle$
$\langle \ell_1, \ell_2 \rangle$	$\ell_1 = \overline{\ell}_2$	$\langle 2, 2 \rangle$
$\langle \ell, \mathsf{v} \rangle$	ℓ is a literal for v	$\langle 2, m \rangle$
$\langle \ell, \mathsf{v} \rangle$	ℓ is not a literal for v	$\langle 2, 0 \rangle$
$\langle \ell, \mathsf{c} \rangle$	$\ell \notin \mathsf{c}$	$\langle 2, 0 \rangle$
$\langle \ell, \mathsf{c} \rangle$	$\ell \in \mathsf{c}$	$\langle 2, m \rangle$
$\langle \ell, \mathsf{f} \rangle$	—	$\langle 2, 1 \rangle$
$\langle \mathsf{v}_1, \mathsf{v}_2 \rangle$ or $\langle \mathsf{c}_1, \mathsf{c}_2 \rangle$ or $\langle \mathsf{v}, \mathsf{c} \rangle$	—	$\langle 2, 2 \rangle$
$\langle \mathsf{v}, \mathsf{f} \rangle$ or $\langle \mathsf{c}, \mathsf{f} \rangle$	—	$\langle 2, 1 \rangle$
$\langle \mathsf{f}_1, \mathsf{f}_1 \rangle$	—	$\langle 1+\delta, 1+\delta \rangle$
$\langle \mathsf{f}_1, \mathsf{f}_2 \rangle$ or $\langle \mathsf{f}_2, \mathsf{f}_1 \rangle$	—	$\langle 1, 1+2\delta \rangle$
$\langle \mathsf{f}_2, \mathsf{f}_2 \rangle$	—	$\langle 1+2\delta, 1 \rangle$

Figure 1: The cost functions for the game $\mathsf{G}(\phi)$. For a profile $\langle s_1, s_2 \rangle$ not in the table, set $\mu_i(s_1, s_2) := \mu_{\overline{i}}(s_2, s_1)$, with $i \in [2]$ and $\overline{i} \neq i$; so, $\overline{i}$ is the player other than i.

For a player $i \in [2]$, denote $p_i(\mathcal{F}) := \sum_{\mathsf{f}\in\mathcal{F}} p_i(\mathsf{f})$, $p_i(\mathsf{L}) := \sum_{\ell\in\mathsf{L}} p_i(\ell)$ and $p_i(\Lambda) := \sum_{\lambda\in\Lambda} p_i(\lambda)$; note that $p_i(\mathcal{F}) + p_i(\Lambda) = 1$. We prove a sequence of technical claims:

Lemma 5.2 *In a* V*-equilibrium* $\langle p_1, p_2 \rangle$ *for* G, $p_1(\Lambda) \cdot p_2(\Lambda) > 0$.

Proof: Assume, by way of contradiction, that $p_i(\Lambda) = 0$ for some player $i \in [2]$; so, $p_i(\mathcal{F}) = 1$. For easier notation, fix $i := 1$. (The proof is the same for $i := 2$.) By Condition (2/c), the Crawford game $\mathsf{G}_C(\delta)$ has no V-equilibrium. Hence, it follows that $p_2(\Lambda) > 0$. We proceed by case analysis on $p_2(\mathcal{F})$.

1. Assume first that $p_2(\mathcal{F}) > 0$; so, $p_2(\Lambda) < 1$. Fix a strategy $\mathsf{f} \in \mathcal{F}$ with $p_2(\mathsf{f}) > 0$. By the cost functions, $\mu_2(\mathsf{f}', \mathsf{f}) \leq 1 + 2\,\delta < 2$ for each strategy $\mathsf{f}' \in \mathcal{F}$. Hence, $\mathsf{E}_2(p_1, p_2^{\mathsf{f}}) < 2$ since $\delta < \frac{1}{2}$. Fix now a strategy $\lambda \in \Lambda$ with $p_2(\lambda) > 0$. By the cost functions, $\mu_2(\mathsf{f}_1, \lambda) = 2$ for

each strategy $\mathsf{f}_1 \in \mathcal{F}$. Hence, $\mathsf{E}_2(p_1, p_2^{\lambda}) = 2$. By the *Weak-Equilibrium-for-Expectation* property for player 2, $\mathsf{E}_2(p_1, p_2^{\mathsf{f}}) = \mathsf{E}_2(p_1, p_2^{\lambda})$. A contradiction.

2. Assume now that $p_2(\mathcal{F}) = 0$; so, $p_2(\Lambda) = 1$. By the cost functions, $\mu_2(\mathsf{f}, \lambda) = 2$ for each pair of strategies $\mathsf{f} \in \mathcal{F}$ and $\lambda \in \Lambda$. Hence, $\mathsf{E}_2(p_1, p_2) = 2$. It follows by the *Risk-Positivity* property that $\mathsf{R}_2(p_1, p_2) = 0$, so that $\mathsf{V}_2(p_1, p_2) = 2$. Consider now player 2 switching to the strategy $\mathsf{f}_2 \in \mathcal{F}$. By Condition (2/a),

$$\mathsf{R}_2\left(p_1, p_2^{\mathsf{f}_2}\right) \;=\; \widehat{\mathsf{R}}_2\left(1, 1+2\,\delta, p_1(\mathsf{f}_1)\right) \;<\; \frac{1}{2}\,.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathsf{E}_2\left(p_1, p_2^{\mathsf{f}_2}\right) &= \underbrace{\mu_2(\mathsf{f}_2, \mathsf{f}_2)}_{=1} \cdot p_1(\mathsf{f}_2) + \underbrace{\mu_2(\mathsf{f}_1, \mathsf{f}_2)}_{=1+2\delta} \cdot p_1(\mathsf{f}_1) \\ &= 1 \cdot p_1(\mathsf{f}_2) + (1+2\delta) \cdot\; p_1(\mathsf{f}_1) \\ &\leq 1 + 2\delta\,,\end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathsf{V}_2\left(p_1, p_2^{\mathsf{f}_2}\right) \\ =\;& \mathsf{E}_2\left(p_1, p_2^{\mathsf{f}_2}\right) + \mathsf{R}_2\left(p_1, p_2^{\mathsf{f}_2}\right) \\ <\;& 1 + 2\delta + \tfrac{1}{2} \\ \leq\;& 2 \qquad\qquad (\text{since } \delta \leq \tfrac{1}{4})\,.\end{aligned}$$

A contradiction to the assumption that $\langle p_1, p_2\rangle$ is a V-equilibrium.

The claim follows. ■

Lemma 5.3 *In a V-equilibrium $\langle p_1, p_2\rangle$ for G, if $p_i(\Lambda) = 1$ then $p_{\overline{i}}(\Lambda) = 1$.*

Proof: Set $i := 1$ so that $p_1(\Lambda) = 1$. By Lemma 5.2, $p_2(\Lambda) > 0$. If $p_2(\Lambda) = 1$, then we are done. So assume $p_2(\Lambda) < 1$. This implies that $p_2(\mathcal{F}) > 0$.

By the cost functions, for each strategy $\mathsf{f} \in \mathcal{F}$, $\mu_2(\lambda, \mathsf{f}) = 1$ for each strategy $\lambda \in \Lambda$. Hence, for each strategy $\mathsf{f} \in \mathcal{F}$ with $p_2(\mathsf{f}) > 0$, *(i)* $\mathsf{E}_2\left(p_1, p_2^{f}\right) = 1$, so that the *Weak-Equilibrium-for-Expectation* property for player 2 implies that $\mathsf{E}_2\left(p_1, p_2^{\lambda}\right) = 1$ for each strategy $\lambda \in \Lambda$ with $p_2(\lambda) > 0$, and *(ii)* $\mathsf{R}_2(p_1, p_2^{\mathsf{f}}) = 0$, by the *Risk-Positivity* property. Hence, $\mathsf{V}_2\left(p_1, p_2^{\mathsf{f}}\right) = 1$.

Assume, by way of contradiction, that there is a strategy $\lambda' \in \Lambda$ with $p_2(\lambda') > 0$ such that $\mu_2(\lambda, \lambda') \neq 1$ for some $\lambda \in \Lambda$ with $p_1(\lambda) > 0$. It follows by the *Risk-Positivity* property that $\mathsf{R}_2(p_1, p_2) > 0$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathsf{V}_2(p_1, p_2) &= \mathsf{E}_2(p_1, p_2) + \mathsf{R}_2(p_1, p_2) \\ &= \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \underbrace{\mathsf{E}_2(p_1, p_2^{\lambda})}_{=1} \cdot p_2(\lambda) + \sum_{\mathsf{f} \in \mathcal{F}} \underbrace{\mathsf{E}_2(p_1, p_2^{\mathsf{f}})}_{=1} \cdot p_2(\mathsf{f}) + \mathsf{R}_2(p_1, p_2) \\ &= 1 + \mathsf{R}_2(p_1, p_2)\,.\end{aligned}$$

Since $\mathsf{V}_2\left(p_1, p_2^{\mathsf{f}}\right) = 1$, player 2 improves her cost by switching to a strategy $\mathsf{f} \in \mathcal{F}$. A contradiction to the assumption that $\langle p_1, p_2 \rangle$ is a V-equilibrium.

Hence, it follows that $\mu_2(\lambda, \lambda') = 1$ for each pair of strategies $\lambda, \lambda' \in \Lambda$ with $p_1(\lambda) > 0$ and $p_2(\lambda') > 0$. By the cost functions, it follows that for each pair of distinct strategies $\lambda, \lambda' \in \Lambda$ with $p_1(\lambda) > 0$ and $p_2(\lambda') > 0$, $\lambda, \lambda' \in \mathsf{L}$ with $\lambda \neq \overline{\lambda'}$, $\mu_1(\lambda, \lambda') = 1$.

Consider now player 1. Note that for each strategy $\lambda \in \Lambda$ with $p_1(\lambda) > 0$, *(i)* $\mu_1(\lambda, \lambda') = 1$ for each strategy $\lambda' \in \Lambda$ with $p_2(\lambda') > 0$, and *(ii)* $\mu_1(\lambda, \mathsf{f}) = 2$ for each strategy $\mathsf{f} \in \mathcal{F}$ with $p_2(\mathsf{f}) > 0$. Hence, $\{\mu_1(\mathbf{s}) \mid \mathbf{p}(\mathbf{s}) > 0\} = \{1, 2\}$, so that $\mathsf{V}_1(p_1, p_2) = \widehat{\mathsf{V}}_1(1, 2, q)$, where $q = p_2(\mathcal{F})$.

Consider player 1 switching to the pure strategy $p_1^{\mathsf{f}_1}$. By the cost functions, $\mu_1(\mathsf{f}_1, \lambda) = 1$ for each strategy $\lambda \in \Lambda$, $\mu_1(\mathsf{f}_1, \mathsf{f}_2) = 1$ and $\mu_1(\mathsf{f}_1, \mathsf{f}_1) = 1 + \delta$. Hence, for $\widehat{\mathbf{p}} = \langle p_1^{\mathsf{f}_1}, p_2 \rangle$, $\{\mu_1(\mathbf{s}) \mid \widehat{\mathbf{p}}(\mathbf{s}) > 0\} = \{1, 1 + \delta\}$, so that $\mathsf{V}_1\left(p_1^{\mathsf{f}_1}, p_2\right) = \widehat{\mathsf{V}}_1\left(1, 1 + \delta, r\right)$, with $r = p_2(\mathsf{f}_1)$. So,

$$\begin{array}{rcl} & & \widehat{\mathsf{V}}_1\left(1, 1 + \delta, r\right) \\ & < & \widehat{\mathsf{V}}_1\left(1, 2, q\right) \quad \text{(by Condition } (2/\mathsf{b}), \text{ since } r \leq q \text{ and } 1 + \delta < 2) \\ & = & \mathsf{V}_1(p_1, p_2)\,. \end{array}$$

So, player 1 improves her cost by switching to the pure strategy $p_1^{\mathsf{f}_1}$. A contradiction to the assumption that $\langle p_1, p_2 \rangle$ is a V-equilibrium. The proof for $i := 2$ is identical except that in the last stage it uses the inequality $\widehat{\mathsf{V}}_2\left(1, 1 + 2\,\delta, r\right) < \widehat{\mathsf{V}}_2\left(1, 2, q\right)$, holding by Condition $(2/\mathsf{b})$. ■

Lemma 5.4 *In a V-equilibrium $\langle p_1, p_2 \rangle$ for G, $p_1(\Lambda) = p_2(\Lambda) = 1$.*

Proof: By Lemma 5.2, $p_1(\Lambda) > 0$ and $p_2(\Lambda) > 0$. If $p_i(\Lambda) = 1$ for some player $i \in [2]$, then, by Lemma 5.3, $p_{\overline{i}}(\Lambda) = 1$, and we are done. So assume that $p_1(\Lambda) < 1$ and $p_2(\Lambda) < 1$; this implies that $p_1(\mathcal{F}) > 0$ and $p_2(\mathcal{F}) > 0$. By the cost functions, for each pair $\lambda, \lambda' \in \Lambda$,

$$\mu_1(\lambda, \lambda') + \mu_2(\lambda, \lambda') \quad \geq \quad 2\,.$$

So,

$$\frac{1}{p_1\left(\Lambda\right)\, p_2\left(\Lambda\right)} \sum_{\lambda, \lambda' \in \Lambda} \left(\mu_1(\lambda, \lambda') + \mu_2(\lambda, \lambda')\right)\, p_1(\lambda)\, p_2(\lambda') \quad \geq \quad 2\,.$$

So, there is a player $i \in [2]$ with

$$b \quad := \quad \frac{1}{p_1\left(\Lambda\right)\, p_2\left(\Lambda\right)} \sum_{\lambda, \lambda' \in \Lambda} \mu_i(\lambda, \lambda')\, p_1(\lambda)\, p_2(\lambda') \quad \geq \quad 1\,.$$

Without loss of generality, set $i := 1$. By the *Weak-Equilibrium-for-Expectation* property for player 1, $\mathsf{E}_1\left(p_1^{\lambda_1}, p_2\right) = \mathsf{E}_1\left(p_1^{\lambda_2}, p_2\right)$ for all $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \Lambda$ with $p_1\left(\lambda_1\right) > 0$ and $p_1\left(\lambda_2\right) > 0$. For $\lambda \in \Lambda$, it holds that

$$\mathsf{E}_1\left(p_1^{\lambda}, p_2\right) \quad = \quad 2\, p_2\left(\mathcal{F}\right) + \sum_{\lambda' \in \Lambda} \mu_1(\lambda, \lambda')\, p_2\left(\lambda'\right)\,.$$

Hence,

$$\sum_{\lambda' \in \Lambda} \mu_1(\lambda_1, \lambda')\, p_2(\lambda') \;=\; \sum_{\lambda' \in \Lambda} \mu_1(\lambda_2, \lambda')\, p_2(\lambda')$$

for all $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \Lambda$ with $p_1(\lambda_1) > 0$ and $p_1(\lambda_2) > 0$. Hence, it follows that for each $\lambda \in \Lambda$ with $p_1(\lambda) > 0$,

$$\sum_{\lambda' \in \Lambda} \mu_1(\lambda, \lambda')\, p_2(\lambda') \;=\; b \cdot p_2(\Lambda)\ .$$

So,

$$\mathsf{E}_1\left(p_1^{\lambda}, p_2\right) \;=\; 2\, p_2(\mathcal{F}) + \underbrace{b}_{\geq 1} \cdot p_2(\Lambda)\ .$$

But for each strategy $\mathsf{f} \in \mathcal{F}$ with $p_1(\mathsf{f}) > 0$,

$$\mathsf{E}_1\left(p_1^{\mathsf{f}}, p_2\right) \;=\; a \cdot p_2(\mathcal{F}) + p_2(\Lambda)\ ,$$

for some a with $|a| < 2$. Hence, the *Weak-Equilibrium-for-Expectation* property for player 1 implies that $\mathsf{E}_1\left(p_1^{\lambda}, p_2\right) = \mathsf{E}_1\left(p_1^{\mathsf{f}}, p_2\right)$, or

$$\underbrace{(2-a)}_{>0} \cdot p_2(\mathcal{F}) \;=\; \underbrace{(1-b)}_{\leq 0} \cdot p_2(\Lambda)\ .$$

A contradiction. ■

We now establish some stronger properties for a V-equilibrium.

Lemma 5.5 *Consider a V-equilibrium $\langle p_1, p_2 \rangle$ for the game G. Then, $p_1(\mathsf{L}) = p_2(\mathsf{L}) = 1$, and for every player $i \in [2]$, for every literal $\lambda \in \mathsf{L}$, $p_i(\lambda) \cdot p_{\bar{i}}(\overline{\lambda}) = 0$. Moreover, $\mathsf{E}_1(p_1, p_2) = \mathsf{E}_2(p_1, p_2) = 1$ and $\mathsf{R}_1(p_1, p_2) = \mathsf{R}_2(p_1, p_2) = 0$.*

Proof: By Lemma 5.4, $p_1(\Lambda) = p_2(\Lambda) = 1$, so that $p_1(\mathcal{F}) = p_2(\mathcal{F}) = 0$. By the cost functions, for each pair $\lambda, \lambda \in \Lambda$, $\mu_1(\lambda, \lambda') + \mu_2(\lambda, \lambda') \geq 2$. So, $\mathsf{E}_1(p_1, p_2) + \mathsf{E}_2(p_1, p_2) \geq 2$. It follows that there is a player $i \in [2]$ such that $\mathsf{E}_i(\Lambda, \Lambda) \geq 1$. For easier notation, take $i := 1$.

By the cost functions, for each $\lambda \in \Lambda$, $\mu_1(\mathsf{f}_1, \lambda) = 1$. If player 1 switches to the pure strategy $p_1^{\mathsf{f}_1}$, then *(i)* $\mathsf{E}_1(p_1^{\mathsf{f}_1}, p_2) = 1 \leq \mathsf{E}_1(p_1, p_2)$, and *(ii)* $\mathsf{R}_1(p_1^{\mathsf{f}_1}, p_2) = 0$, by the *Risk-Positivity* property. Since $\mathsf{R}_1(p_1, p_2) \geq 0$ (by the *Risk-Positivity* property), it follows that if either $\mathsf{E}_1(p_1, p_2) > 1$ or $\mathsf{R}_1(p_1, p_2) > 0$, then player 1 improves her cost by switching to $p_1^{\mathsf{f}_1}$. Since $\langle p_1, p_2 \rangle$ is a V-equilibrium, it follows that both $\mathsf{E}_1(p_1, p_2) = 1$ and $\mathsf{R}_1(p_1, p_2) = 0$.

Now, $\mathsf{E}_1(p_1, p_2) + \mathsf{E}_2(p_1, p_2) \geq 2$ and $\mathsf{E}_1(p_1, p_2) = 1$ together imply that $\mathsf{E}_2(p_1, p_2) \geq 1$. In the same way as above, $\mathsf{E}_2(p_1, p_2) = 1$ and $\mathsf{R}_2(p_1, p_2) = 0$ follow.

By the cost functions, for each pair $\lambda, \lambda' \in \Lambda$, $\mu_1(\lambda, \lambda') + \mu_1(\lambda, \lambda') \geq 2$. We have just shown that $\mathsf{E}_1(p_1, p_2) + \mathsf{E}_2(p_1, p_2) = 2$. This implies that $\mu_1(\lambda, \lambda') = \mu_2(\lambda, \lambda') = 1$ for each pair $\lambda, \lambda' \in \Lambda$ with $p_1(\lambda) > 0$ and $p_2(\lambda') > 0$. Thus, by the cost functions, $\lambda, \lambda' \in \mathsf{L}$, so that $p_1(\mathsf{L}) = p_2(\mathsf{L}) = 1$, and $p_i(\lambda) > 0$ implies that $p_{\overline{i}}(\overline{\lambda}) = 0$ for all pairs of a player $i \in [2]$ and a literal $\lambda \in \mathsf{L}$. ■

We continue to prove:

Lemma 5.6 *In a* V*-equilibrium* $\langle p_1, p_2 \rangle$ *for* G*, for each player* $i \in [2]$ *and for each literal* $\ell \in \mathsf{L}$*,* $p_i(\ell) + p_i(\overline{\ell}) > 0$*.*

Proof: Assume, by way of contradiction, that there is a player $i \in [2]$ and a literal $\ell \in \mathsf{L}$ such that $p_i(\ell) = p_i(\overline{\ell}) = 0$. Without loss of generality, set $i := 2$. Recall that, by Lemma 5.5, $\mathsf{V}_1(p_1, p_2) = 1$ and $p_2(\mathsf{L}) = 1$.

Consider player 1 switching to the pure strategy p_1^{v} for the variable v such that ℓ and $\overline{\ell}$ are literals for v. By the cost functions, $\mu_1(\mathsf{v}, \lambda) = m$ if $\lambda \in \{\ell, \overline{\ell}\}$, and 0 if $\lambda \in \mathsf{L} \setminus \{\ell, \overline{\ell}\}$. Since $p_2(\mathsf{L}) = 1$ and $p_2(\ell) = p_2(\overline{\ell}) = 0$, it follows that $\mu_1(\mathsf{v}, \lambda) = 0$ for all strategies λ with $p_2(\lambda) > 0$. Thus, *(i)* $\mathsf{E}_1(p_1^{\mathsf{v}}, p_2) = 0$, and *(ii)* $\mathsf{R}_1(p_1^{\mathsf{v}}, p_2) = 0$ (by the *Risk-Positivity* property). Hence, $\mathsf{V}_1(p_1^{\mathsf{v}}, p_2) = 0$, so that player 1 improves her cost by switching to the pure strategy p_1^{v}. A contradiction to the assumption that $\langle p_1, p_2 \rangle$ is a V-equilibrium. ■

Finally, we prove:

Lemma 5.7 *A* V*-equilibrium* $\langle p_1, p_2 \rangle$ *for* G *induces a unique truth assignment for* ϕ*.*

Proof: For each pair of a player $i \in [2]$ and a literal $\ell \in \mathsf{L}$, it holds that *(i)* $p_1(\ell) + p_1(\overline{\ell}) > 0$ (by Lemma 5.6), and *(ii)* if $p_i(\ell) > 0$, then $p_{\overline{i}}(\overline{\ell}) = 0$ (by Lemma 5.5). Thus, for each variable v, there is a literal ℓ for v such that $p_1(\ell), p_2(\ell) > 0$ and $p_1(\overline{\ell}) = p_2(\overline{\ell}) = 0$. ■

We are now ready to prove:

Lemma 5.8 *ϕ is satisfiable if and only if $\mathsf{G}(\phi)$ has a V-equilibrium.*

Proof: "⇐:" Assume first that ϕ is *not* satisfiable. Assume, by way of contradiction, that $\mathsf{G}(\phi)$ has a V-equilibrium $\langle p_1, p_2 \rangle$. By Lemma 5.7, $\langle p_1, p_2 \rangle$ induces a unique truth assignment γ for ϕ. Since ϕ is not satisfiable, there is a clause c such that for each literal ℓ with $p_1(\ell), p_2(\ell) > 0$, $\ell \notin \mathsf{c}$. Consider now player 1 switching to the pure strategy p_1^{c}. Then,

$$\mathsf{E}_1(p_1^{\mathsf{c}}, p_2) \quad = \quad \sum_{\ell \in \mathsf{L} | p_2(\ell) > 0} \underbrace{\mu_1(\mathsf{c}, \ell)}_{=0} \cdot p_2(\ell) \quad = \quad 0\,,$$

and $\mathsf{R}_1\left(p_1^{\mathsf{c}}, p_2\right) = 0$ (by the *Risk-Positivity* property), so that $\mathsf{V}_1\left(p_1^{\mathsf{c}}, p_2\right) = 0$. By Lemma 5.5, $\mathsf{V}_1(p_1, p_2) = 1$. So, player 1 improves her cost by switching to the pure strategy p_1^{c}. A contradiction to the assumption that $\langle p_1, p_2\rangle$ is a V-equilibrium.

"$\Rightarrow$:" Assume now that ϕ is satisfiable. For a satisfying assignment γ of ϕ, set $p_i(\ell) := \frac{1}{m}$ for each literal $\ell \in \mathsf{L}$ with $\gamma(\ell) = 1$. We shall prove that $\langle p_1, p_2\rangle$ is a V-equilibrium. Fix a player $i \in [2]$. By the cost functions, $\mu_i(\ell_j, \ell_k) = 1$ for each pair of literals ℓ_j, ℓ_k with $p_1(\ell_j) \cdot p_2(\ell_k) > 0$. Hence, the *Risk-Positivity* property implies that $\mathsf{R}_i(p_1, p_2) = 0$. Furthermore,

$$\mathsf{E}_i(p_1, p_2) \quad = \quad \sum_{\langle \ell_j, \ell_k\rangle \in \mathsf{L} \mid \gamma(\ell_j) = \gamma(\ell_k) = 1} \mu_i(\ell_j, \ell_k)\, p_1(\ell_j) \cdot p_2(\ell_k) \quad = \quad m^2 \cdot 1 \cdot \frac{1}{m} \cdot \frac{1}{m} \quad = \quad 1\,.$$

So, player i may decrease V_i only if she decreases E_i. It suffices to prove that player i cannot decrease E_i by switching to a pure strategy. We proceed by case analysis.

1. Consider player i switching to the pure strategy p_1^{v} for a variable $\mathsf{v} \in \mathcal{V}$ with literals $\ell, \overline{\ell}$. By the cost functions, for each literal $\lambda \in \mathsf{L}$, $\mu_i\left(\mathsf{v}, \lambda\right) = m$ if $\lambda \in \{\ell, \overline{\ell}\}$ and 0 otherwise. By construction, $p_i(\ell) + p_i(\overline{\ell}) = \frac{1}{m}$. So,

$$\mathsf{E}_i\left(p_i^{\mathsf{v}}, p_{\overline{i}}\right) \quad = \quad 0 \cdot \left(1 - \frac{1}{m}\right) + m \cdot \frac{1}{m} \quad = \quad 1\,.$$

2. Consider player i switching to the pure strategy p_i^{c} for a clause $\mathsf{c} \in \mathcal{C}$. By the cost functions, for each literal $\lambda \in \mathsf{L}$, $\mu_i\left(\mathsf{c}, \lambda\right) = m$ if $\lambda \in \mathsf{c}$ and 0 otherwise. Since ϕ is satisfiable, there is at least one literal $\ell \in \mathsf{c}$ with $\gamma(\ell) = 1$; hence, by construction of $p_{\overline{i}}$, there is at least one literal $\ell \in \mathsf{c}$ with $p_{\overline{i}}(\ell) = \frac{1}{m}$. Thus,

$$\mathsf{E}_i\left(p_i^{\mathsf{c}}, p_{\overline{i}}\right) \quad = \quad \sum_{\ell \in \mathsf{c} \mid p_{\overline{i}}(\ell) > 0} \underbrace{\mu_i\left(\mathsf{c}, \ell\right)}_{=m} \cdot p_{\overline{i}}(\ell) \quad \geq \quad m \cdot \frac{1}{m} \quad = \quad 1\,.$$

3. Consider player i switching to the pure strategy p_i^{f} for some $\mathsf{f} \in \mathcal{F}$. By construction of the cost functions, for each literal $\lambda \in \mathsf{L}$, $\mu_i\left(\mathsf{f}, \ell\right) = 1$. It follows that $\mathsf{E}_i\left(p_i^{\mathsf{f}}, p_{\overline{i}}\right) = 1$.

4. Finally, consider player i switching to the pure strategy p_i^{ℓ} for some literal $\ell \in \mathsf{L}$. Assume first that $\gamma(\ell) = 1$. Then, $p_{\overline{i}}(\overline{\ell}) = 0$. Hence, by the cost functions, $\mu_i(\ell, \ell') = 1$ for each literal $\ell' \in \mathsf{L}$ with $p_{\overline{i}}(\overline{\ell}) > 0$. It follows that $\mathsf{E}_i\left(p_i^{\ell}, p_{\overline{i}}\right) = 1$. Assume now that $\gamma(\ell) = 0$. Then, $p_{\overline{i}}(\overline{\ell}) = \frac{1}{m}$. By the cost functions, $\mu_i(\ell, \overline{\ell}) = 2$ and $\mu_i(\ell, \ell') = 1$ for $\ell' \in \mathsf{L} \setminus \{\overline{\ell}\}$ with $p_{\overline{i}}(\ell') > 0$. It follows that

$$\mathsf{E}_i\left(p_i^{\ell}, p_{\overline{i}}\right) \quad = \quad 2 \cdot \frac{1}{m} + 1 \cdot \left(1 - \frac{1}{m}\right) \quad = \quad 1 + \frac{1}{m}\,.$$

The claim now follows. ■

Lemma 5.8 establishes the reduction for the $\mathcal{NP}$-hardness; since the numbers involved in the reduction are polynomially bounded, strong $\mathcal{NP}$-hardness follows. ■

5.2 Concrete $\mathcal{NP}$-Hardness Result

We remark that the proof of the reduction for Theorem 5.1 is modular in treating V in an abstract way through using *Risk-Positivity, Weak-Equilibrium-for-Expectation,* and the properties in Condition (2). This modularity yields an extension of Theorem 5.1 to concrete $(\mathsf{E}+\mathsf{R})$-valuations enjoying these properties. We shall verify Conditions (1) and (2) from Theorem 5.1 for the $(\mathsf{E}+\mathsf{R})$-valuations V, where (1) $\mathsf{R} = \gamma \cdot \mathsf{Var}$, or (2) $\mathsf{R} = \gamma \cdot \mathsf{SD}$, or a valuation (3) $\mathsf{V} = \lambda\,(\mathsf{E} + \gamma \cdot \mathsf{Var}) + (1-\lambda)\,\mathsf{V}^{\nu}$, with $0 < \lambda \leq 1$, where $\nu(x) = x^r$, with $r \geq 2$, and with $\gamma > 0$. The *Weak-Equilibrium-for-Expectation* property in Condition (1) follows from Corollary 3.3. For Condition (2), we shall prove three technical claims associated with Conditions (2/a), (2/b) and (2/c), respectively. We start with Condition (2/a). We remark that the existence of a δ such that $\widehat{\mathsf{R}}(1, 1+2\delta, q) < \frac{1}{2}$ for each probability $q \in [0,1]$ follows already from the continuity of R; but its polynomial time computation is bound to depend on each particular $\widehat{\mathsf{R}}$. We prove:

Lemma 5.9 *Fix an* $(\mathsf{E}+\mathsf{R})$*-valuation* V*, where* (1) $\mathsf{R} = \gamma \cdot \mathsf{Var}$*, or* (2) $\mathsf{R} = \gamma \cdot \mathsf{SD}$*, or* (3) $\mathsf{V} = \lambda\,(\mathsf{E} + \gamma \cdot \mathsf{Var}) + (1-\lambda)\,\mathsf{V}^{\nu}$*, with* $0 < \lambda \leq 1$*, where* $\nu(x) = x^r$ *with* $r \geq 2$*, and with* $\gamma > 0$*. Then, there is a polynomial time computable* Δ *with* $0 < \Delta \leq \frac{1}{4}$ *such that* $\widehat{\mathsf{R}}(1, 1+2\delta, q) < \frac{1}{2}$ *for all* $q \in [0,1]$ *and* $0 \leq \delta < \Delta$*.*

Proof: For each valuation V, we shall choose a suitable Δ.

(1) $\underline{\mathsf{R} = \gamma \cdot \mathsf{Var}\text{:}}$ Then, $\gamma \cdot \widehat{\mathsf{R}}\,(1, 1+2\delta, q) = \gamma \cdot q(1-q) \cdot 4\delta^2 \leq \gamma \cdot \frac{1}{4} \cdot 4\delta^2 = \gamma \cdot \delta^2$. Choose Δ as a rational number no larger than $\frac{1}{4} \cdot \min\left\{\frac{1}{\sqrt{\gamma}}, 1\right\}$. This choice satisfies that for each $\delta < \Delta$, $\gamma \cdot \delta^2 < \frac{1}{2}$.

(2) $\underline{\mathsf{R} = \gamma \cdot \mathsf{SD}\text{:}}$ Then, $\gamma \cdot \widehat{\mathsf{R}}\,(1, 1+2\delta, q) = \gamma \cdot \sqrt{q(1-q)} \cdot 2\delta \leq \gamma \cdot \frac{1}{2} \cdot 2\delta = \gamma \cdot \delta$. Choose $\Delta := \frac{1}{4} \cdot \min\left\{\frac{1}{\gamma}, 1\right\}$. This choice satisfies that for each $\delta < \Delta$, $\gamma \cdot \delta < \frac{1}{2}$.

(3) $\underline{\mathsf{V} = \lambda(\mathsf{E} + \gamma \cdot \mathsf{Var}) + (1-\lambda)\mathsf{V}^{\nu} \text{ where } \nu(x) = x^r \text{ with } r \geq 2\text{:}}$
Consider first the risk valuation $\mathsf{R} = \mathsf{V}^{\nu} - \mathsf{E}$, where $\nu(x) = x^r$ with $r \geq 2$. Note that

$$\widehat{\mathsf{R}}\,(1, 1+2\delta, q) \quad = \quad \sqrt[r]{q \cdot (1+2\delta))^r + (1-q)} - 1 - q \cdot (2\delta)\,.$$

Set $\Delta := \frac{1}{4}$. Then, for every $\delta < \Delta$, the fact that $\widehat{\mathsf{R}}\,(1, 1+2\delta, q)$ increases monotonically in δ implies that

$$\widehat{\mathsf{R}}\,(1, 1+2\delta, q) \;\leq\; \sqrt[r]{1 + q \cdot \left(\left(\frac{3}{2}\right)^r - 1\right)} - 1 - q \cdot \frac{1}{2}\,;$$

for $q = 0$, $\sqrt[r]{1 + 0 \cdot \left(\left(\frac{3}{2}\right)^r - 1\right)} - 1 - 0 \cdot \frac{1}{2} = 0 < \frac{1}{2}$. So assume that $q > 0$. Then, by the fact that $\sqrt[r]{1 + q \cdot \left(\left(\frac{3}{2}\right)^r - 1\right)}$ increases monotonically in q and $0 < q \leq 1$, we get that $\widehat{\mathsf{R}}\,(1, 1+2\delta, q) \leq \frac{3}{2} - 1 - q \cdot \frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{2} - q \cdot \frac{1}{2} < \frac{1}{2}$ since $q > 0$.

Combined with the choice of Δ for (1), the required property for the convex combination $\mathsf{V} = \lambda(\mathsf{E} + \gamma \cdot \mathsf{Var}) + (1-\lambda)\mathsf{V}^\nu$, where $\nu(x) = x^r$ with $r \geq 2$, holds by choosing Δ as a rational number no larger than $\min\left\{\frac{1}{4} \cdot \min\left\{\frac{1}{\sqrt{\gamma}}, 1\right\}, \frac{1}{4}\right\} = \frac{1}{4} \cdot \min\left\{\frac{1}{\sqrt{\gamma}}, 1\right\}$.

■

We continue with Condition (2/b). We prove:

Lemma 5.10 *Fix an* $(\mathsf{E}+\mathsf{R})$*-valuation* V*, where* (1) $\mathsf{R} = \gamma \cdot \mathsf{Var}$*, or* (2) $\mathsf{R} = \gamma \cdot \mathsf{SD}$*, or* (3) $\mathsf{V} = \lambda\,(\mathsf{E} + \gamma \cdot \mathsf{Var}) + (1-\lambda)\,\mathsf{V}^\nu$*, with* $0 < \lambda \leq 1$*, where* ν *is increasing and strictly convex, and with* $\gamma > 0$*. Then, there is a polynomial time computable* Δ *with* $0 < \Delta \leq \frac{1}{4}$ *such that* $\widehat{\mathsf{V}}(1, 1+2\delta, r) < \widehat{\mathsf{V}}(1, 2, q)$ *for all* $q \in (0,1)$*, with* $0 \leq r \leq q$*, and* $0 \leq \delta < \Delta$*.*

Proof: For each valuation V, we shall choose a suitable Δ.

Case (1): $\mathsf{R} = \gamma \cdot \mathsf{Var}$: Note that

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{\mathsf{V}}(1, 1+2\delta, r) &= (1+2\delta) \cdot r + 1 \cdot (1-r) + \gamma \cdot r(1-r) \cdot 4\delta^2 \\ &= 2\delta \cdot r + 1 + \gamma \cdot r(1-r) \cdot 4\delta^2\,,\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{\mathsf{V}}(1, 2, q) &= 2 \cdot q + 1 \cdot (1-q) + \gamma \cdot q(1-q) \\ &= q + 1 + \gamma \cdot q(1-q)\,.\end{aligned}$$

Note also that

$$\max_{0 \leq r \leq q} r(1-r) \;=\; \begin{cases} \frac{1}{4}\,, & \text{if } q \geq \frac{1}{2} \\ q(1-q)\,, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}\,.$$

If $q \leq \frac{1}{2}$, then $r(1-r) \leq q(1-q)$. Choosing $\Delta := \frac{1}{4}$, this implies immediately that $\widehat{\mathsf{V}}(1, 1+2\delta, r) < \widehat{\mathsf{V}}(1, 2, q)$ for $0 \leq \delta < \Delta$. Consider now $q > \frac{1}{2}$ and set $\Delta := \min\left\{\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2(1+\gamma)}\right\}$. Denote $A := 1 + \delta(2q + \gamma)$. Then, for $\delta < \Delta$,

$$\widehat{\mathsf{V}}(1, 1+2\delta, r) \;\leq\; 2\delta \cdot q + 1 + \gamma \cdot \delta^2 \;<\; A\,,$$

while

$$\begin{array}{rcl} & A & \\ < & 1+\Delta\cdot(2q+\gamma) & (\text{since } \delta<\Delta) \\ = & 1+\frac{2q+\gamma}{2(1+\gamma)} & \\ < & 1+\frac{2q(1+\gamma)}{2(1+\gamma)} & (\text{since } q>\frac{1}{2}) \\ = & 1+q & \\ < & \widehat{\mathsf{V}}(1,2,q)\,. & \end{array}$$

Case (2): $\mathsf{R}=\gamma\cdot\mathsf{SD}$: Then,

$$\widehat{\mathsf{V}}(1,1+2\delta,r) \;=\; 2\delta\cdot r+1+\gamma\cdot\sqrt{r(1-r)}\cdot 2\delta\,,$$

and

$$\widehat{\mathsf{V}}(1,2,q) \;=\; q+1+\gamma\cdot\sqrt{q(1-q)}\,.$$

For $q\leq\frac{1}{2}$, the argument is identical to the one for Case (1). Consider now $q>\frac{1}{2}$, and set again $\Delta:=\min\left\{\frac{1}{4},\frac{1}{2(1+\gamma)}\right\}$. Denote again $A:=1+\delta(2q+\gamma)$. By arguments identical to those for Case (1), we derive that $\widehat{\mathsf{V}}(1,1+2\delta,r)<A$ and $A\leq q+1<\widehat{\mathsf{V}}(1,2,q)$.

Case (3): $\mathsf{V}=\lambda\cdot(\mathsf{E}+\gamma\cdot\mathsf{Var})+(1-\lambda)\cdot\mathsf{V}^{\nu}$, ν increasing and strictly convex.
Consider first the valuation $\mathsf{V}=\mathsf{V}^{\nu}$. Note that

$$\widehat{\mathsf{V}}^{\nu}(1,1+2\delta,r) \;=\; \nu^{-1}\left(\nu(1)\cdot(1-r)+\nu(1+2\delta)\cdot r\right)\,,$$

and

$$\widehat{\mathsf{V}}^{\nu}(1,2,q) \;=\; \nu^{-1}\left(\nu(1)\cdot(1-q)+\nu(2)\cdot q\right)\,.$$

Thus,

$$\widehat{\mathsf{V}}^{\nu}(1,1+2\delta,r) \;<\; \widehat{\mathsf{V}}^{\nu}(1,2,q)$$

if and only if

$$r\cdot(\nu(1+2\delta)-\nu(1)) \;<\; q\cdot(\nu(2)-\nu(1))\,.$$

Set $\Delta:=\frac{1}{4}$. Since $r\leq q$, ν is strictly increasing and $1+2\delta<2$ for $\delta<\Delta$, the last inequality holds, and we are done.

Combined with the choice of Δ for (1), the required property for the convex combination $\mathsf{V}=\lambda\cdot(\mathsf{E}+\gamma\cdot\mathsf{Var})+(1-\lambda)\cdot\mathsf{V}^{\nu}$, where ν is increasing and strictly convex, holds by choosing $\Delta:=\min\left\{\min\left\{\frac{1}{4},\frac{1}{\gamma}\right\},\frac{1}{4}\right\}=\min\left\{\frac{1}{4},\frac{1}{\gamma}\right\}$. ■

Last, for Condition (2/c), we use the *Weak-Equilibrium-for-Expectation* property to prove:

Lemma 5.11 *Fix an* $(\mathsf{E}+\mathsf{R})$*-valuation* V*, where* (1) $\mathsf{R}=\gamma\cdot\mathsf{Var}$*, or* (2) $\mathsf{R}=\gamma\cdot\mathsf{SD}$*, or* (3) $\mathsf{V}=\lambda\left(\mathsf{E}+\gamma\cdot\mathsf{Var}\right)+(1-\lambda)\,\mathsf{V}^{\nu}$*, with* $0<\lambda\leq 1$*, where* ν *is increasing and strictly convex, and with* $\gamma>0$*. Then, for any* δ*,* $0<\delta<1$*, the Crawford game* $\mathsf{G}_C(\delta)$ *has no* V*-equilibrium.*

Proof: $\mathsf{G}_C(\delta)$ has no pure equilibrium due to the following cycle of *improvement steps*:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc}(\mathsf{f}_1,\mathsf{f}_1) & \xrightarrow{1} & (\mathsf{f}_2,\mathsf{f}_1) & \xrightarrow{2} & (\mathsf{f}_2,\mathsf{f}_2) & \xrightarrow{1} & (\mathsf{f}_1,\mathsf{f}_2) & \xrightarrow{2} & (\mathsf{f}_1,\mathsf{f}_1)\\ \langle 1+\delta,1+\delta\rangle & & \langle 1,1+2\,\delta\rangle & & \langle 1+2\,\delta,1\rangle & & \langle 1+\delta,1+\delta\rangle & & \end{array}$$

Assume, by way of contradiction, that $\mathsf{G}_C(\delta)$ has a mixed V-equilibrium $\mathbf{p}$. Denote $p_1:=\langle x,1-x\rangle$ and $p_2:=\langle y,1-y\rangle$. Note that

$$\mathsf{E}_1\left(p_1^{\mathsf{f}_1},p_2\right) \;=\; y\cdot(1+\delta)+(1-y)\cdot 1 \;=\; 1+y\cdot\delta\,,$$

and

$$\mathsf{E}_1\left(p_1^{\mathsf{f}_2},p_2\right) \;=\; y\cdot 1(1+\delta)+(1-y)\cdot(1+\delta) \;=\; 1+2\delta-2y\cdot\delta\,.$$

By the *Weak-Equilibrium-for-Expectation* property,

$$\mathsf{E}_1\left(\langle p_1^{\mathsf{f}_1},p_2\rangle\right) \;=\; \mathsf{E}_1\left(\langle p_1^{\mathsf{f}_2},p_2\rangle\right),$$

or $1+y\cdot\delta=1+2\delta-2y\cdot\delta$, yielding $y=\frac{2}{3}$. So, $p_2=\left\langle\frac{2}{3},\frac{1}{3}\right\rangle$.

Case (3): Clearly,

$$\mathsf{E}_1(\mathbf{p}) \;=\; \mathsf{E}_1\left(\langle p_1^{\mathsf{f}_1},p_2\rangle\right) \;=\; \frac{1}{3}\cdot(3+2\delta)\,,$$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathsf{Var}_1(\mathbf{p}) &= x\cdot\frac{2}{3}\cdot(1+\delta)^2+x\cdot\frac{1}{3}\cdot 1^2+(1-x)\cdot\frac{2}{3}\cdot 1^2+(1-x)\cdot\frac{1}{3}\cdot(1+2\delta)^2-\left(\frac{1}{3}\cdot(3+2\delta)\right)^2\\ &= \frac{2\delta^2}{3}\cdot\left(\frac{4}{3}-x\right),\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\mathsf{V}_1^{\nu}(\mathbf{p}) \;=\; \nu^{-1}\left(x\cdot\frac{2}{3}\cdot\nu(1+\delta)+(1-x)\cdot\frac{1}{3}\cdot\nu(1)+x\cdot\frac{2}{3}\cdot\nu(1)+(1-x)\cdot\frac{1}{3}\cdot\nu(1+2\delta)\right),$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathsf{V}_1(\mathbf{p})\\ =\;&\lambda\cdot\left(\mathsf{E}_1(\mathbf{p})+\gamma\cdot\mathsf{Var}_1(\mathbf{p})\right)+(1-\lambda)\cdot\mathsf{V}_1^{\nu}(\mathbf{p})\\ =\;&\lambda\cdot\left(\frac{1}{3}\cdot(3+2\delta)+\gamma\cdot\frac{2\delta^2}{3}\cdot\left(\frac{4}{3}-x\right)\right)+(1-\lambda)\cdot\\ &\cdot\nu^{-1}\left(x\cdot\frac{2}{3}\cdot\nu(1+\delta)+(1-x)\cdot\frac{1}{3}\cdot\nu(1)+x\cdot\frac{2}{3}\cdot\nu(1)+(1-x)\cdot\frac{1}{3}\cdot\nu(1+2\delta)\right).\end{aligned}$$

Since *(i)* p_1 is a V_1-best-response to p_2 and *(ii)* V_1 is concave in the mixed strategy p_1, the *Optimal-Value* property (Proposition 3.1) implies that there is a constant A such that $\mathsf{V}_1(\mathbf{p}) = A$ for all $x \in [0,1]$. Since $\delta \neq 0$, this yields a contradiction for $\lambda = 1$. So assume $0 < \lambda < 1$. Then, for all $x \in [0,1]$,

$$\begin{aligned} & A \\ = \; & \lambda \cdot \left(\frac{1}{3} \cdot (3 + 2\delta) + \gamma \cdot \frac{2\delta^2}{3} \cdot \left(\frac{4}{3} - x \right) \right) + (1 - \lambda) \cdot \\ & \cdot \nu^{-1} \left(x \cdot \frac{2}{3} \cdot \nu(1+\delta) + (1-x) \cdot \frac{1}{3} \cdot \nu(1) + x \cdot \frac{2}{3} \cdot \nu(1) + (1-x) \cdot \frac{1}{3} \cdot \nu(1+2\delta) \right) . \end{aligned}$$

Rearranging yields $\nu(c_1 + d_1 x) = c_2 + d_2 x$, for some constants c_1, d_1, c_2 and d_2 with $d_1 := \frac{\lambda}{\lambda - 1} \cdot \frac{2\,\delta^2}{3} \neq 0$, for all $x \in [0,1]$. Hence,

$$\nu(x) \quad = \quad c_2 - c_1 \cdot \frac{d_2}{d_1} + \frac{d_2}{d_1} \cdot x$$

for all $x \in [0,1]$, so that ν is not strictly convex. A contradiction.

Case (1): This is the special case of Case (3) with $\lambda = 1$.

Case (2): Note that

$$\left(\mathsf{E}_1 + \gamma \cdot \mathsf{SD}_1 \right)(\mathbf{p}) \quad = \quad \frac{1}{3} \cdot (3 + 2\delta) + \gamma \cdot \delta \cdot \sqrt{\frac{2}{3} \cdot \left(\frac{4}{3} - x \right)} .$$

Since *(i)* p_1 is a $(\mathsf{E}_1 + \gamma \cdot \mathsf{SD}_1)$-best-response to p_2 and *(ii)* $\mathsf{E}_1 + \gamma \cdot \mathsf{SD}_1$ is concave in the mixed strategy p_1, the *Optimal-Value* property (Proposition 3.1) implies that there is a constant A such that $(\mathsf{E}_1 + \gamma \cdot \mathsf{SD}_1)(\mathbf{p}) = A$ for all $x \in [0,1]$. Since $\delta \neq 0$, this yields a contradiction. ■

Now, for Condition (2) in Theorem 5.1, choose δ as a rational number no larger than the minimum of the Δ from Lemma 5.9 and the Δ from Lemma 5.10, both of which are polynomial time computable for the $(\mathsf{E} + \mathsf{R})$-valuations in Theorem 5.12. This choice guarantees that all Conditions (2/a), (2/b) and (2/c) in Theorem 5.1 are satisfied by the chosen δ. Hence, it follows:

Theorem 5.12 *Fix an* $(\mathsf{E} + \mathsf{R})$*-valuation* V*, where* (1) $\mathsf{R} = \gamma \cdot \mathsf{Var}$*, or* (2) $\mathsf{R} = \gamma \cdot \mathsf{SD}$*, or* (3) $\mathsf{V} = \lambda\,(\mathsf{E} + \gamma \cdot \mathsf{Var}) + (1 - \lambda)\,\mathsf{V}^{\nu}$*, with* $0 < \lambda \leq 1$*, where* $\nu(x) = x^r$ *with* $r \geq 2$*, and with* $\gamma > 0$*. Then,* $\exists$V-EQUILIBRIUM *is strongly* $\mathcal{NP}$*-hard for 2-players games.*

6 Epilogue

We embarked on a research direction making different-from-classical assumptions on the behavior of the players in order to model the real-world in a more accurate way and gain insights

that explain reality better. We have developed a framework for games with players minimizing an $(\mathsf{E}+\mathsf{R})$-valuation V. Our framework enabled proving the strong $\mathcal{NP}$-hardness of $\exists\mathsf{V}$-EQUILIBRIUM in the simplest cases of games with two strategies or two players, respectively, and for many significant choices of $(\mathsf{E}+\mathsf{R})$-valuations V.

Besides these central results, our study is making a number of additional conceptual and technical contributions through introducing several new analytical and combinatorial tools and techniques, which are of wider applicability and interest; we summarize here the main ones.

- Our proof techniques have relied heavily on the *Weak-Equilibrium-for-Expectation* property, which indicates its computational power.
- We introduced E-strict concavity as the most general known class of valuations with the *Weak-Equilibrium-for-Expectation* property.
- We imported ν-valuations from Actuarial Risk Theory [18] into the realm of equilibrium computation and revealed some of their algorithmic properties; ditto for higher moments, generalizing the variance considered before in [12, 22], which were used before as risk-modeling valuations in Portfolio Theory [19].
- We established the *Mixed-Player-Has-Pure-Neighbors* property, which explicitly identifies a class of games and a corresponding class of valuations where mixed equilibria get "endangered" (cf. [7, 12]).

Our work opens up a wide avenue for future research towards revealing the complexity of $\exists\mathsf{V}$-EQUILIBRIUM for other valuations V. Most obviously, the modularity of the proof of Theorem 5.1 may allow, similarly to Theorem 5.12, direct derivation of new concrete complexity results for other valuations that will be shown to have the assumed properties. Enhancing the class of E-strictly concave valuations may yield such new valuations, which may be directly accomodated into the general framework we developed. But new tools and techniques may be required for settling the complexity of $\exists\mathsf{V}$-EQUILIBRIUM when V is not concave or not E-strictly concave, or when it lacks the *Weak-Equilibrium-for-Expectation* property. It is not clear whether and how our framework could be extended to accomodate even *quasiconcave* valuations. We conclude with such an example, cast into the context of maximization games. The *Sharpe ratio* valuation, formulated as $\mathsf{SR}=\frac{\mathsf{E}}{1+\mathsf{SD}}$ [27], is the ratio of a convex over a concave function; although it is not convex, it is *quasiconvex* as shown in [29]. Does SR have the *Weak-Equilibrium-for-Expectation* property? What is the complexity of $\exists\mathsf{SR}$-EQUILIBRIUM?

References

[1] K. J. Arrow, "The Theory of Risk-Aversion," reprinted in *Aspects of the Theory of Risk Bearing,* Y. J. Assatio, Helsinki, 1965.

[2] R. J. Aumann, "Correlated Equilibrium an an Expression of Bayesian Rationality," *Econometrica,* Vol. 55, No. 1, pp. 1–18, January 1987.

[3] E. T. Bell, "Partition Polynomials," *Annals of Mathematics,* Vol. 24, pp. 38–46, 1927.

[4] D. Bernoulli, "Exposition of a New Theory on the Measurement of Risk," *Commentaries of the Imperial Academy of Science of Saint Petersburg* (in Latin), 1738. English translation in *Econometrica,* Vol. 22, No. 1, pp. 23–36, January 1954.

[5] M. Brautbar, M. Kearns and U. Syed, "Private and Third-Party Randomization in Risk-Sensitive Equilibrium Concepts," *Proceedings of the 24th AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence,* pp. 723–728, July 2010.

[6] V. Conitzer and T. Sandholm, "New Complexity Results about Nash Equilibria," *Games and Economic Behavior,* Vol. 63, No. 2, pp. 621–641, July 2008.

[7] V. P. Crawford, "Equilibrium Without Independence," *Journal of Economic Theory,* Vol. 50, No. 1, pp. 127–154, February 1990.

[8] G. Debreu, "A Social Equilibrium Existence Theorem," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America,* Vol. 38, pp. 886–893, 1952.

[9] E. Denel, Z. Safra and U. Segel, "Existence and Dynamic Consistency of Nash Equilibrium with Non-Expected Utility Preferences," *Journal of Economic Theory,* Vol. 55, No. 2, pp. 229–246, December 1991.

[10] E. J. Elton, M. J. Gruber, S. J. Brown and W. N. Goetzmann, *Modern Portfolio Theory and Investment Analysis,* John Wiley & Sons, 2007.

[11] K. Fan, "Fixed Point and Minimax Theorems in Locally Convex Topological Linear Spaces," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences,* Vol. 38, No. 52, pp. 121–126, February 1952.

[12] A. Fiat and C. H. Papadimitriou, "When the Players are not Expectation-Maximizers," *Proceedings of the 3rd International Symposium on Algorithmic Game Theory,* pp. 1–14, Vol. 6386, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Springer-Verlag, October 2010.

[13] A. Fiat and C. H. Papadimitriou, *Personal Communication,* Email 06/23/2015, 06:39:58 PM.

[14] I. Fisher, *The Nature of Capital and Income,* The Macmillan Company, 1906.

[15] M. Friedmann and L. J. Savage, "The Utility Analysis of Choices Involving Risk," *The Journal of Political Economy,* Vol. 56, No. 4, pp. 279–304, August 1948.

[16] M. R. Garey and D. S. Johnson, *Computers and Intractability: A Guide to the Theory of $\mathcal{NP}$-Completeness,* W. H. Freeman and Co., 1979.

[17] G. Hanoch and H. Levy, "The Efficiency Analysis of Choices Involving Risk," *The Review of Economic Studies,* Vol. 36, No. 3, pp. 335–346, July 1969.

[18] R. Kaas, M. Goodvaerts, J. Dhaene and M. Denuit, *Modern Actuarial Risk Theory Using R,* Second Edition, Springer, 2008.

[19] A. Kraus and R. H. Litzenberger, "Skewness Preference and the Valuation of Risky Assets," *Journal of Finance,* Vol. 31, No. 4, pp. 1085–1094, September 1976.

[20] P. Krokhmal, M. Zabarankin and S. Uryasev, "Modeling and Optimization of Risk," *Surveys in Operations Research and Management Science,* Vol. 16, pp. 49–66, 2011.

[21] H. Markowitz, "Portfolio Selection," *Journal of Finance,* Vol. 7, pp. 77–91, March 1952.

[22] M. Mavronicolas and B. Monien, "Minimizing Expectation Plus Variance," *Theory of Computing Systems,* Vol. 57, No. 3, pp. 617–654, October 2015.

[23] I. Milchtaich, "Congestion Games with Player-Specific Payoff Functions," *Games and Economic Behavior,* Vol. 13, No. 1, pp. 111–124, March 1996.

[24] J. F. Nash, "Equilibrium Points in n-Person Games," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America,* Vol. 36, No. 1, pp. 48–49, 1950.

[25] J. F. Nash, "Non-Cooperative Games," *Annals of Mathematics,* Vol. 54, No. 2, pp. 286–295, 1951.

[26] C. H. Papadimitriou, "On the Complexity of the Parity Argument and Other Inefficient Proofs of Existence," *Journal of Computer and System Sciences,* Vol. 48, No. 3, pp. 498–532, June 1994.

[27] W. F. Sharpe, "A Simplified Model for Portfolio Analysis," *Management Science,* Vol. 9, No. 2, pp. 277–293, January 1963.

[28] M. C. Steinbach, "Markowitz Revisited: Mean-Variance Models in Financial Portfolios," *SIAM Review,* Vol. 43, No. 1, pp. 31–85, 2001.

[29] S. V. Stoyanov, S. T. Rachev and F. Fabozzi, "Optimal Financial Portfolios," *Applied Mathematical Finance,* Vol. 14, No. 5, pp. 401–436, 2007.

A FP-Strict Concavity

We recall the following definition from [12, Section 2], rendering their notation and vocabulary.

Definition A.1 (FP-Strict Convexity) *Fix a player $i \in [n]$. The valuation V_i is* FP*-strictly convex if for any* fixed *partial mixed profile $\mathbf{x}_{-i}$, for any pair of payoff distributions $\mathsf{P}_i(x_i', \mathbf{x}_{-i}) \neq \mathsf{P}_i(x_i'', \mathbf{x}_{-i})$, where x_i' and x_i'' are mixed strategies, and for any α with $0 < \alpha < 1$, it holds that*

$$\mathsf{V}_i\left(\alpha x_i' + (1-\alpha)x_i'', \mathbf{x}_{-i}\right) \quad < \quad \alpha \mathsf{V}_i\left(x_i', \mathbf{x}_{-i}\right) + (1-\alpha)\mathsf{V}_i\left(x_i'', \mathbf{x}_{-i}\right) .$$

We quote from [12, Section 2] that the *payoff distribution* $\mathsf{P}_i = \mathsf{P}_i(\mathbf{p})$ is the probability distribution induced from a mixed profile $\mathbf{p}$ on the range of possible payoffs for player i over all profiles; so, the probability that player i receives payoff a is $\sum_{\mathbf{s} \in S | \mu_i(\mathbf{s}) = a} \mathbf{p}(\mathbf{s})$. Recall also that V_i is FP-strictly concave if $-\mathsf{V}_i$ is FP-strictly convex. We observe:

Observation A.1 *The valuation $\mathsf{V} = \mathsf{E} - \mathsf{Var}$ is* not FP*-strictly convex.*

Proof: By counterexample. Consider the game G with two players 1 and 2, with $S_1 = \{s_1, s_2\}$ and $S_2 = \{t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4\}$. The utilities for player 1 are given by

$$p_1(s_1, t_j) \quad = \quad \begin{cases} \frac{9}{2}, & \text{if } j = 1 \\ \frac{7}{2}, & \text{if } j = 2 \\ 0, & \text{if } j \in \{3, 4\} \end{cases} ,$$

and

$$p_1(s_2, t_j) \quad = \quad \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } j \in \{1, 2\} \\ 5, & \text{if } j = 3 \\ \frac{15}{4}, & \text{if } j = 4 \end{cases} .$$

Player 2 has chosen the mixed strategy $x_2 = \left\langle \frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{10}, \frac{2}{5} \right\rangle$. For player 1, x_1' is the pure strategy s_1; x_1'' is the pure strategy s_2. Then, clearly, the induced payoff distributions $\mathsf{P}_1(x_1', x_2)$ and $\mathsf{P}_1(x_1'', x_2)$ are different.

Note that for every mixed strategy x_1 of player 1,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathsf{V}_1(x_1, x_2) &= \mathsf{E}_1(x_1, x_2) - \mathsf{Var}_1(x_1, x_2) \\ &= \mathsf{E}_1(x_1, x_2) - \widehat{\mathsf{E}}_1(x_1, x_2) + (\mathsf{E}_1(x_1, x_2))^2 , \end{aligned}$$

where $\widehat{\mathsf{E}}_1$ denotes the expectation for the square game G^2 (where the utilities are the squares of the utilities for G). It is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathsf{E}_1(x_1', x_2) &= \frac{1}{4} \cdot \frac{9}{2} + \frac{1}{4} \cdot \frac{7}{2} = 2\,, \\ \mathsf{E}_1(x_1'', x_2) &= \frac{1}{10} \cdot 5 + \frac{2}{5} \cdot \frac{15}{4} = 2\,, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\mathsf{E}}_1(x_1', x_2) &= \frac{1}{4} \cdot \left(\frac{9}{2}\right)^2 + \frac{1}{4} \cdot \left(\frac{7}{2}\right)^2 = 8 + \frac{1}{8}\,, \\ \widehat{\mathsf{E}}_1(x_1'', x_2) &= \frac{1}{10} \cdot 5^2 + \frac{2}{5} \cdot \left(\frac{15}{4}\right)^2 = 8 + \frac{1}{8}\,. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\mathsf{V}_1(x_1', x_2) = \mathsf{V}_1(x_1'', x_2)\,.$$

Now, set $x_1 = \alpha x_1' + (1-\alpha)x_1''$, where $0 < \alpha < 1$. By linearity of expectation,

$$\mathsf{E}_1(x_1, x_2) = \mathsf{E}_1(x_1', x_2) = \mathsf{E}_1(x_1'', x_2)$$

and

$$\widehat{\mathsf{E}}_1(x_1, x_2) = \widehat{\mathsf{E}}_1(x_1', x_2) = \widehat{\mathsf{E}}_1(x_1'', x_2)\,.$$

Hence,

$$\mathsf{V}_1(x_1, x_2) = \mathsf{V}_1(x_1', x_2) = \mathsf{V}_1(x_1'', x_2)\,.$$

So, V_1 is *not* FP-strictly convex. ■